DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 058 474 AA 000 778

AUTHOR	Vlaanderen, Russell B.; Lindman, Erick L.
TITLE	Intergovernmental Relations and the Governance of Education.
INSTITUTION	Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo.
SPONS AGENCY	President's Commission on School Finance, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	29 Oct 71
CONTRACT	OEC-0-71-2413(010)
NOTE	194p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Conferences; Data Analysis; *Educational Accountability; *Educational Finance; Educational Policy; Federal Aid; *Federal State Relationship; *Governance; Government Role; Questionnaires; Role Perception; State Aid; *State School District Relationship

ABSTRACT

The roles of each level of government, Federal, State, and local, in providing quality education and equal educational opportunity were studied. To determine the roles, the opinions of informed and concerned political and educational leaders were sought through the administration of a questionnaire and the holding of a conference. Through these means, answers to the following six questions were sought: (1) What are the responsibilities of each level of government to (a) assure every child a minimum level of educational opportunity, (b) upgrade the quality of education throughout the country, and (c) stimulate school systems to meet categories of national need? (2) Can the role of each level of government be rationalized and generally accepted? (3) How can responsibility and accountability be applied at each level? (4) What are the appropriate relationships between the executive and school boards, commissions, and the chief state school officer? (5) How can the concept of new federalism be applied to the educational field? (6) Can a mechanism for incorporating the views of each level be established for educational policy development and for identification of national priorities? If so, what would be the best mechanism. Tabulations of the responses by region and respondent's position are provided, as are the conference papers. Findings, conclusions, and recommendations are given. (For related document, see ED 058 473.) (DB)

Intergovernmental Relations and the Governance of Education

Prepared by
Education Commission of the States

Submitted to The President's Commission on School Finance

THIS IS ONE OF SEVERAL REPORTS PREPARED FOR THIS COMMISSION. TO AID IN OUR DELIBERATIONS, WE HAVE SOUGHT THE BEST QUALIFIED PEOPLE AND INSTITUTIONS TO CONDUCT THE MANY STUDY PROJECTS RELATING TO OUR BROAD MANDATE. COMMISSION STAFF MEMBERS HAVE ALSO PREPARED CERTAIN REPORTS.

WE ARE PUBLISHING THEM ALL SO THAT OTHERS MAY HAVE ACCESS TO THE SAME COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS OF THESE SUBJECTS THAT THE COMMISSION SOUGHT TO OBTAIN. IN OUR OWN FINAL REPORT WE WILL NOT BE ABLE TO ADDRESS IN DETAIL EVERY ASPECT OF EACH AREA STUDIED. BUT THOSE WHO SEEK ADDITIONAL INSIGHTS INTO THE COMPLEX PROBLEMS OF EDUCATION IN GENERAL AND SCHOOL FINANCE IN PARTICULAR WILL FIND MUCH CONTAINED IN THESE PROJECT REPORTS.

WE HAVE FOUND MUCH OF VALUE IN THEM FOR OUR OWN DELIBERATIONS. THE FACT THAT WE ARE NOW PUBLISHING THEM, HOWEVER, SHOULD IN NO SENSE BE VIEWED AS ENDORSEMENT OF ANY OR ALL OF THEIR FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS. THE COMMISSION HAS REVIEWED THIS REPORT AND THE OTHERS BUT HAS DRAWN ITS OWN CONCLUSIONS AND WILL OFFER ITS OWN RECOMMENDATIONS. THE FINAL REPORT OF THE COMMISSION MAY WELL BE AT VARIANCE WITH OR IN OPPOSITION TO VIEWS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THIS AND OTHER PROJECT REPORTS.

The President's Commission
on School Finance

Neil H. McElroy, Chairman
Mary T. Brooks
William G. Colman
Hilda A. Davis
John B. Davis, Jr.
John H. Fischer
Dorothy M. Ford
Norman Francis
Eugene Gonzales
Warren P. Knowles
David H. Kurtzman
Duane Mattheis
William E. McManus
Wendell H. Pierce
William G. Saltonstall
W. B. Thompson
Clarence Walton
Ivan E. Zylstra

Norman Karsh, Executive Director

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS
AND THE
GOVERNANCE OF EDUCATION

A Report
to
The President's Commission on School Finance

by

Russell B. Vlaanderen
Erick L. Lindman

Work accomplished under Contract No. OEC-0-71-2413 (010)
Date: October 29, 1971

Education Commission of the States
300 Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80203

The conclusions arrived at in this report are those of the project staff and are not to be construed as official positions of the Education Commission of the States. The work accomplished in this project was pursuant to a contract with the President's Commission on School Finance. . .

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Overview of the Project 1

II. Summary of Findings 13

III. Conclusions and Recommendations 25

Appendices 37

I. Overview of the Project

The Problem

The formal structure of school governance is made up of a federal government, fifty state governments, a large number of intermediate units (including counties), and more than 20,000 local school districts. Thousands of laymen serving as board members, legislators, congressmen, jurists, citizen committees, and general volunteers are involved in establishing educational policy throughout the different levels of government. Hundreds of thousands of persons serve the schools as employees. Local school districts range in size from the largest, such as New York City, which enrolls more than a million pupils, to non-operating districts such as exist in the Midwest, which have school boards but enroll no pupils, own no buildings, and do not operate schools. Some districts serve only elementary school pupils, while others provide programs from preschool years through four-year colleges. Some school districts have only three board members; many have five- or seven-member boards; and others are even larger. Most school board members are elected by popular vote, but about ten per cent are appointed through differing appointment procedures. Some school districts are dependent on other local units of government for financial support, but most school districts are largely autonomous in regard to finance (except for state and federal aid) as well as curricular and other policy issues. Different types of intermediate units also exist. These range from the county as an intermediate unit (one of the first types of intermediate units to be formed) to those units which are regional in scope and which provide services which local school districts cannot provide by themselves.

Although there are many similarities in the manner in which the fifty states conduct their educational enterprise, there are also some significant differences. Hawaii has chosen to govern its educational affairs centrally, and has provided but one school district, which is the state. Nebraska, on the other hand, continues to support about 3,000 local districts, each with its board of education, and each relatively independent of the state educational agency and the state government. There are approximately 53,000 pupils in the state of Alaska, while New York, on the other hand, enrolls nearly three and on-half million students. Forty-eight of the states have some type of state board of education responsible in varying degrees for establishing policies and regulations governing the elementary and secondary schools of the state, and in some instances, institutions of higher education. These state boards vary widely in their degree of influence and power.

The legal structure of school governance is divided into three levels: the federal government, the state government, and local units (intermediate units may be thought of as belonging either to the state level or the local level, depending upon the functions to be carried out by the intermediate unit).

One of the most significant developments in American education is the increased awareness of education's importance for the achievement of our national goals. The result of this increased awareness is the emergence of the federal government in an increasingly important role in financing and governing education, particularly in those areas which will contribute to the achievement of national priorities. Financial aid from the federal government is virtually exclusively in the form of categorical aid. It focuses on identified critical areas of weakness, the strengthening of which is seen as a vital contribution to the achievement of national goals. The increased participation of the federal government in education has resulted, in part, in (1) the awareness of the fact that a new partnership has been formed among the federal, state and local levels rather than the traditional two; that is, state and local; (2) decision making power in education is increasingly rising to the state level and shows some signs of rising to the federal level in certain areas.

All three branches of the federal government, the executive, legislative and judicial, are involved in the governance of education. The President proposes budgets, signs or vetoes education bills, and emphasizes national priorities. The Congress translates policies into action programs by passing legislation and the judicial branch exerts considerable influence in the governance of education by virtue of its decisions. State level government, by and large, duplicates or attempts to model itself upon the federal government by virtue of the fact that there are also three branches: executive, legislative and judicial, at the state government level. Governors are becoming increasingly interested in education and this interest is evidenced in part by the fact that some governors are attempting to exert more influence on education by seeking more power over educational matters. They seek this power by proposing to change the selection method of state boards of education and chief state school officers. Appointment by the governor of either the state board of the state superintendent of public instruction or both, they contend, would place more power in the hands of the executive branch and the people could hold accountable a more specific office than is presently the case.

At the local level, the analogy into three branches of government begins to break down. While it is true that the local school board may be analogous to the state legislature and to the national Congress in that it makes policy, the analogy to the executive branch is weakened by the fact that the superintendent is an employee of the board and is responsible to it, is not elected to his office by an electorate, and does not have, in general, any powers except those bestowed upon him by the board of education.

The current ferment in education is a reflection and an integral part of the dissatisfaction and unrest exhibited in society as a whole. Issues which were vigorously discussed -- and presumably resolved -- several decades ago are being debated again. The demands of lay people, particularly minority groups, to have a greater voice in the policy making procedures of the local schools, is injecting an element of stress into the governance of education. Many innovations in instruction which have been introduced in order to satisfy the demands of parents and students have been found wanting. One of the reasons why so many innovations have failed may be the fact that they are introduced into a matrix of the traditional form of governance in education. As a result, many changes in administration and governance are being proposed at the local, state and national levels.

According to the results of a survey conducted by the Education Commission of the States a number of changes have occurred in the states during the last two years while still others are being proposed. Kansas has changed its constitution to provide for an elected state board of education and the appointment of a chief state school officer will be one of its responsibilities. Before this new system really had a chance to operate, it was already under attack by a citizen's commission in Kansas, who are at the present time urging that the chief state school officer be an appointment of the governor.

Rhode Island in 1969 reorganized its structure by combining all public education under a single board of regents, abolishing the state board of education and the college trustees effective July, 1970. North Carolina is attempting to strengthen the state board of higher education by adding, as ex officio members, the governor (who will serve as chairman of the board) and the chairmen of the Senate and House committees on appropriations, finance and higher education. Legislation in 1969 and 1970 changed the structure of the governance of technical and post high school programs in Hawaii by placing the responsibility for the administration of these programs under the community college system of the University of Hawaii, and has designated the university board of regents as the state board for vocational education. A constitutional amendment has been approved by the electorate of Alabama which makes the office of the state superintendent appointive by an elective board. Florida has reorganized the executive branch of the state government and has included in that reorganization the state department of education in order to provide a single policy making and coordinating board for all public education in one agency which will operate through four divisions: elementary and secondary, vocational, community colleges, and universities. Legislation is being proposed in Oregon to provide for a single state board of education to replace the existing state boards of higher education (for education and the educational coordinating council).

In Florida, the operational control of the junior colleges was transferred from district school boards to a separate local board of trustees. A number of states have made it possible for school districts to form cooperative units and legislation is being proposed in Colorado, North Dakota, Rhode Island, West Virginia and South Dakota to provide for regionalization of educational services in those states. In addition, proposals have been made in Michigan and Maryland to abolish the state board of education; and in Ohio, Vermont, Maryland, Michigan and Illinois, to provide for the appointment of the chief state school officer by the governor and to provide cabinet status for him.

Information currently being supplied to the Education Commission of the States in connection with its legislative information project reveals that many changes are being proposed in the current sessions of the state legislatures. A resolution has been introduced in Georgia proposing an amendment to the constitution so as to create an entirely new state board of education. In Iowa, a bill has been introduced to provide for the appointment of the superintendent of public instruction by the governor. Another bill in Iowa would create a department of general services, transferring some of the services presently being performed by the state department of education to the newly created department. A report to the joint budget committee of the General Assembly of the state of Colorado prepared by the Stanford Research Institute after a year-long study recommends among other things that the chief state school officer be appointed by the governor rather than by an elected state school board as is presently the case. It further recommends that the chief state school officer should be a management expert rather than an educator.

One of the most important functions to be carried out by any level of governance is that of resource allocation. Recent court decisions relating to civil rights have resulted in increased emphasis on equal educational opportunity. Patrons in many school districts, because of their increased interest in education and concern for equal educational opportunity for their children, have instituted suits alleging that the method of financing schools is discriminatory in its effect upon pupils. Plaintiffs allege that the method of financing education penalizes students living in poor districts and results in taxpayers in these districts having to bear a heavier burden to obtain for their children an education equal to, or in many instances, inferior to, the education obtained by children of parents who reside in richer districts. Discrimination on the basis of geographic location is claimed. The remedies that are asked vary from mandating the reallocation of funds by the legislature (as exemplified by suits in California, Michigan, Texas, Virginis, Minnesota, and Wisconsin) to reallocation by the courts if the legislature fails to act (California, Texas, Virginia, and Wisconsin) and to declaring the method of allocation unconstitutional (Illinois).

One of the cases (Serrano vs. Priest) has been decided by the California Supreme Court. The opinion of the court essentially declares that any system of school finance which makes the quality of education of any student a function of the wealth of the district in which he resides rather than of the wealth of the state as a whole violates the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment. In denying a motion to dismiss, the judge of a Federal District Court in Minnesota recently declared that the reasoning followed in Serrano vs. Priest was essentially correct. Similar suits have been filed or intentions to file have been declared in at least 21 states. Although the essence of these complaints is the financial system for the support of education, the implications of full, or nearly full, state funding of education are immense. These implications are discussed more fully in the section on conclusions and recommendations.

Recognizing the importance of intergovernmental relations, the President's Commission on School Finance developed Project #1, known as Intergovernmental Relations and the Governance of Education. The questions which were to be answered are:

1. What are the respective responsibilities of each level of government to (a) assure every child a minimum level of educational opportunity, (b) upgrade the quality of education throughout the country, and (c) stimulate school

systems to meet categories of national need?

2. Can the role of each level of government be rationalized and generally accepted?
3. How can responsibility and accountability be applied at each level?
4. What are the appropriate relationships between the executive (Governor, Mayor) and school boards, commissions, and the chief state school officer?
5. How can the concept of new federalism be applied to the educational field?
6. Can a mechanism for incorporating the views of each level be established for educational policy development and for identification of national priorities? If so, what would be the best mechanism?

Procedures

The President's Commission on School Finance contracted with the Education Commission of the States to conduct the project. Dr. Erick L. Lindman of the University of California at Los Angeles was contracted as chief consultant. Coordination of the project was the responsibility of the Director of Research of the Education Commission of the States.

Although all available resources were to be used in arriving at conclusions and recommendations, it was felt that the opinion of informed and concerned political and educational leaders would be a valuable resource. To obtain this body of opinion, two activities were carried out; (1) the administration of an opinionnaire, and (2) a conference which would address itself to the six questions.

The questionnaire was developed by the chief consultant, and modified and approved for transmittal at a meeting held at ECS headquarters in Denver, Colorado, in attendance at which were the chief consultant, the project director, ECS staff members, and the project monitor from the staff of the President's Commission. Unfortunately, time constraints prohibited a tryout of the instrument before administration (subsequent analysis confirmed that this would have been a valuable activity).

At this meeting also was decided the categories of respondents to whom the opinionnaire would be administered. These were all:

1. Governors,
2. Chairmen of education and appropriation committees of state legislatures,
3. Chief State School Officers,
4. Presidents or chairman of state boards of education,
5. Presidents of state school board associations,
6. Presidents of state administrators' associations,
7. Presidents of state teachers' associations, and
8. Presidents of state PTA's.

In addition, federal officials were to be selected by the staff of the President's Commission. A letter of transmittal was prepared for the signature of Wendell H. Pierce, Executive Director of ECS, and a followup letter was sent approximately one month later. Sample letters of transmittal and a sample followup letter are included in Appendix A. These procedures produced over a 70% return. Tabulation of the responses was accomplished by the ECS Department of Research and the analysis was made by the chief consultant. A sample questionnaire (with total responses in terms of percentages) is included in Appendix A. The responses analyzed by position and region are to be found in Appendix A.

The site chosen for the conference was the Jackson Lake Lodge, Moran, Wyoming. The project director, where possible, obtained the names of conference participants on the basis of recommendations requested from the executive directors of national organizations, and relied on the knowledge of the ECS staff in terms of political leaders to be invited. A sample letter of invitation is found in Appendix B. The project director contracted with Dr. Roald Campbell, Fawcett Professor of Educational Administration at Ohio State University in Columbus and Dr. Alan Campbell, Professor of Political Science and Dean of the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs of Syracuse University, New York, to write and present position papers to the conference. Professor Lindman also produced a paper intended to set directions for the conference. These papers, plus other conference materials are included in Appendix B. A transcription of the final session of the conference was prepared for analysis by the project staff for the purposes of arriving at conclusions and recommendations.

II. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The purpose of this section is summarize the findings of the project activities in terms of the six questions, utilizing the results of the questionnaire, and the contents of the papers prepared for the conference. Other resources available to the project staff will be included in the next section, in which conclusions are drawn and recommendations are made. Because of the nature of the six questions and inherent inadequacies in questionnaires as an instrument of inquiry, the items in the questionnaire were directed mostly to questions 1, 3 and 4, with some relevancy to questions 2 and 5.

Questions 1, 2, and 5 are closely related and responses to a number of items in the questionnaire are applicable to all three. However, in the interest of avoiding repetition, the staff has categorized the items and they are reported under the questions to which they appear to be most relevant. Similarly, an examination of the transcript of the reporting session of the conference reveals that conference participants tended to discuss questions 1, 2, and 5 in conjunction with each other.

1. What are the respective responsibilities of each level of government to (a) assure every child a minimum level of educational opportunity, (b) upgrade the quality of education throughout the country, and (c) stimulate school systems to meet categories of national need?

More than two-thirds of the respondents to the questionnaire agreed with the following statements pertaining to state and local government:

1. While the goal-setting function for public education is appropriately shared by all three levels of government and by the people generally, the local educational agency is responsible for operating schools and should be given freedom to select the methods to attain established goals.

2. The local school board should have authority to employ, assign, and dismiss teachers under general procedures established by law.

3. The local school board should negotiate with organizations representing its teachers and enter into contracts with them concerning salaries and fringe benefits.

4. To provide for the development of new educational programs and to test their effectiveness, the state should authorize optional supplementary programs and provide for their support jointly from state and local sources.

5. The optional supplementary programs should be jointly financed by the state and the local school district, but the state should contribute a greater percent of the cost of such programs to school districts in which taxable wealth per pupil is below the state average.

6. The state education agency should receive and administer all federal funds for public schools in accordance with state plans developed by the state and approved by the federal government.

7. The state should establish broad goals for public education, determine the resources required to attain these goals, and assure that the needed resources are available for schools in all parts of the state without excessive taxation.

8. To assure maximum equalization of educational opportunity, the state should define a standard program of educational services and require all public schools to provide at least these services.

9. Federal aids for public elementary and secondary schools should be designed to encourage state and/or local financial support for public schools by relating federal grants to school tax effort.

10. As a condition for receiving federal general purpose grants-in-aid for public schools, the state should be required to adopt a plan which assures that all public schools in the state will be adequately supported.

More than two-thirds of the respondents disagreed with the following statements:

1. The local school board should negotiate with organizations representing its teachers and enter into contracts with them concerning curriculum content.

2. The local school board should negotiate with organizations representing its teachers and enter into contracts with them concerning teaching procedures.

3. To equalize school resources and local tax rates among school districts within a state, the local school property tax should be abolished and all school tax income should be derived from state and federal sources.

4. Federal aids for public elementary and secondary schools should be designed to equalize salaries of school employees among states.

5. The federal government should contribute toward the cost of education for all children and youth, including those attending church-related and other non-profit schools.

Conference participants discussed this question in terms of a "compact" submitted to the conference by Professor Erick Lindman. The "compact" may be found in Appendix B. Specifically, conference participants concluded that federal responsibilities were to (1) provide substantial educational funding to the states in the form of general aid, so as to make educational services more nearly equal between and within states. (2) consolidate federal categorical aid into a few "block grants," (3) complete the annual appropriations process in time to permit effective planning by state and local education agencies, (4) assume primary responsibility for financing and coordinating research and development for education, and (5) develop and help finance in cooperation with state and local education agencies an interconnecting system of educational data and information collection.

Conference participants agreed that state responsibilities were to (1) maintain a free public school system, (2) set goals and objectives and provide appropriate evaluation of the accomplishments of these goals, (3) require attendance at an educational institution of all children and youth between the ages of 6 and 16, (4) insure that no child will be denied admission to any public school because of his race, religion, or ethnic origin, (5) insure that all elementary and secondary schools maintain a program of instruction designed to meet the varying needs of all children and youth in the state, (6) encourage innovation and development of new educational programs, (7) provide for a uniform, comprehensive system of educational data and management information, (8) provide improved evaluation and planning competency at the state level, (9) assure adequate financial resources without excessive local tax burden, and (10) complete the annual appropriation process in time for effective planning by local education agencies.

Conference participants agreed that local responsibilities were to (1) employ, assign and dismiss staff and negotiate contracts concerning salaries and employee benefits under general procedures established by law, (2) plan, design and construct educational facilities, (3) levy local or regional taxes to supply part of the operating and facilities costs, (4) develop with local citizens the educational goals and objectives for each school area or region, and (5) establish and implement procedures for periodic and systematic review of the scope and effectiveness of its education program, including evaluation of achievement versus its preset goals and objectives.

2. Can the role of each level of government be rationalized and generally accepted?

The questionnaire, as an instrument of inquiry, does not lend itself to answering this question, particularly in quantifying results since answers to this question would necessarily be in narrative form. Additionally, conference participants tended to address this question in conjunction with question 1. It is significant that one group of conference participants reported that had the question been worded, "Should the role of each level of government be rationalized and generally accepted?" the answer would be much easier to arrive at. They were, however, pessimistic about general acceptance being accomplished. It should be noted, however, that conference participants tended to confuse "role" with "structure" -- over which there is much more controversy than the role of each level. An examination of the degree of consensus obtained in the questionnaire and in the conference on the activities to be conducted at each level of government lead to the conclusions presented in the next section.

3. How can responsibility and accountability be applied at each level?

Both questionnaire respondents and conference participants believed in the great importance of the concept of accountability. More than 90% of the respondents agreed with the following statements:

1. The governing board of a local educational agency should establish a systematic procedure for periodic reviews of the scope and effectiveness of its educational program, and these reviews should be the basis for expanding,curtailing or changing various programs.
2. The state education agency should provide evidence concerning the effectiveness of public school programs for the governor, the legislature, and the public.

Accountability appears to be akin to motherhood. Unfortunately, the method by which one achieves accountability is not nearly so well agreed upon as the method by which one achieves motherhood. Some conference participants argued that accountability should be implemented at the school building level, not at the district or state level. Others favor the development of units for planning and evaluation in state departments of education to achieve statewide accountability. Some thought that categorical aid should be related to student test scores. Others felt that categorical aid should be granted to schools upon the basis of educational services rendered to students, not upon their test scores. The conference clearly recognized the need for accountability but was not in a position to solve the complex problems involved in the evaluation of educational programs.

An examination of the current literature in the field reveals that there is no generally accepted definition of accountability and that theorists are only now beginning to turn their attention to the development of a viable system of accountability. Given the present state of the art, it is clear that we are sailing in uncharted waters. However, for the purposes of this report, the section on conclusions and recommendations does adopt a working definition of accountability and makes recommendations for its implementation.

4. What are the appropriate relationships between the executive (Governor, Mayor) and school boards, commissions, and the chief state school officer?

More than two-thirds of the respondents to the questionnaire agreed with the following statements:

1. Since local education agencies are becoming administratively and fiscally more dependent upon state government, they should not be dependent administratively or fiscally upon general city or county government.

2. To make local school systems responsive to local and parental concerns, school boards should be elected by the people.

A second question pertaining to the relationship between local educational agencies and local general government was included in the questionnaire. Nine out of ten respondents disagreed with the following statement:

> To assure coordination between public schools and other local government services, the public school system should be a department of city or county government responsible to the chief executive officer of the city or county.

Three questions pertaining to the structure of educational government at the state level were included in the questionnaire. Responses to these questions indicated that:

1. Eighty percent of all respondents believe that the state education agency should be responsible to the state board of education.

2. Seventy-six percent of all respondents believe that the chief state school officer should be appointed by the state board of education.

3. Forty-nine percent of all respondents believe that the state board of education should be appointed by the governor; 40% believe that the state board of education should be elected by the people.

This question about the structure of educational government was discussed extensively at the conference. In his paper, Alan Campbell suggested a new structure for education which would have the following characteristics:

1. Full state assumption of financial responsibility for education;

2. A large increase in federal aid with strong guidelines for focusing the aid on educational need;

3. A decentralized system of local districts below the state level (with perhaps a regional level between the state and these decentralized districts).

4. Only if a regional system is used would a local financial supplement be permitted;

5. At the state level, education should become an executive department like any other, with its head appointed by the governor.

Professor Roald Campbell expressed the view that "state boards of education should be retained and state board members should be appointed by the governor with the approval of the senate." He emphasized that such board members would be "in a good position to interact with the governor regarding the problems and needs of education in the state."

The chief state school officer, according to Roald Campbell, should be appointed by the state board of education and be accountable to it. In addition to the traditional functions of the state education agency, the chief state school officer and his staff should place greater emphasis upon planning and evaluation.

There was general agreement among the participants that education is a state function and that local educational agencies are state agencies. For this reason, they should be independent of general county or city government.

There was some disagreement, however, concerning the best structure for educational government at the state level. The conflicting views of Dean Alan Campbell and Professor Roald Campbell have already been noted. The former would have the chief state school officer appointed by the governor; the latter recommends appointment of the chief state school officer by the state board of education. Most of the participants in the conference supported Professor Roald Campbell's position on this issue.

There was also disagreement concerning the best method for selecting the state board of education. Dr. Richard Ando, President of the Hawaii State Baord of Education, representing the only state-operated school system, favored an elected state board of education. Representatives from the larger states tended to favor appointment of the state board of education by the governor.

Governor Askew of Florida expressed the view that public education needs gubernatorial leadership and this leadership is more likely to appear if the governor appoints the state board of education. He felt that legislative confirmation of the governor's appointees obscured the distinction between the executive and legislative functions of government. He would also have the chief state school officer appointed by the governor.

At the present time there are nine methods by which state boards of education are selected. In 32 states they are appointed by the governor. In seven, they are elected by a partisan ballot, and in three, they are elected on a non-partisan ballot. In one state, seven members are elected on a non-partisan ballot, and this elected board in turn appoints two additional members to represent agriculture and labor. In one state, the state legislature selects the state board of education. In one state, a legislative delegation is the state board of education.

In one state , local school boards select the state board. In one state, the state board is composed of the chief state school officer, the secretary of state, and the attorney general; and in one state, the state board is composed of the chief state school officer, the governor, the attorney general, the secretary of state, the commissioner of agriculture, the state treasurer, and the comptroller. The length of term varies from three to fifteen years. In only one state has the term been set at fifteen years; the next highest term is nine years. It is significant to note that the state in which this 15-year term appears is the state in which the state legislature selects the board of education. This is the state of New York and is representative of the state in which the state board of education has many powers and is closely tied to the legislative branch of the government rather than the executive branch. Also, in the state of New York, the state board of education appoints the chief state school officer.

In 26 of the states, the state board of education appoints the chief state school officer while in 22 states the chief state school officer is elected by popular vote. The terms are for two or four years and the methods of election vary greatly. A few have political convention nominations. Others have bi-partisan or non-partisan ballots. Quite apart from the political elections in these states, some of these are special elections held in the Spring instead of the Fall when the political elections occur. It is significant to note that respondents to the questionnaire disagreed on the method of the selection of the state board of education more than on any other question. Forty-nine percent believed that the state board of education should be appointed by the governor and 40% believed that the state board of education should be elected by the people. This, as opposed to actual practice; in 66% of the cases the board is selected by the governor and in 23% of the cases, the board is elected by popular vote. In addition, 76% of all respondents believed that the chief state school officer should be appointed by the state board of education, while in actual practice, only 54% are appointed by the board.

An examination of the extensive literature in this field also indicates a sharp division. By and large political scientists believe that the board and chief state school officer should be subject to appointment and control by the chief executive officer of the state, that is, the governor; whereas, educators prefer a method which gives some measure of independence from both the executive and legislative branches of the government.

5. How can the concept of new federalism be applied to the educational field?

Much of the study related directly to the federal role in the field of education. There was among the conference participants a readiness to assign a more prominent role to the federal government. This readiness was hedged by concerns that federal guidelines and controls might become excessive.

There was agreement that the federal government should concentrate upon interstate and fiscal problems, leaving the operational control to state and local educational agencies. Most of the respondents to the questionnaire indicated that the federal share of the cost of public education should be increased until the federal contribution reaches an optimum of approximately 30% of the total cost.

More than two-thirds of the respondents to the questionnaire agreed with the following statements pertaining to the federal role:

1. There should be a Secretary of Education in the President's Cabinet.
2. The federal government should consolidate its numerous categorical aids for education into a few "block grants."
3. The federal government should share its revenues with states and municipalities for general governmental purposes, including, but not limited to, education.
4. Federal aids for public elementary and secondary schools should be designed to equalize educational programs and services among states.

In his paper presented to the conference, Professor Lindman included a prepared "compact" indicating the obligations that the states and federal government should accept with respect to education. This paper was discussed and the suggested "compact" was revised reflecting the views of the conference participants. The "compact" is included in Appendix B.

6. Can a mechanism for incorporating the views of each level be established for educational policy development and for identification of national priorities?

This question did not lend itself to investigation through the questionnaire and unfortunately, conference participants did not address themselves adequately and could arrive at no conclusions concerning it other than to say that meetings such as the conference convened at Jackson Hole, bringing together a diverse group of people, seemed to be a good mechanism.

III. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this section is to present conclusions, and where appropriate, recommendations to the President's Commission on School Finance, based upon the results of the activities of the project together with information from other relevant sources.

It is extremely difficult to arrive at conclusions under any one particular question without including some discussion of elements of some of the other questions. For instance, to assign responsibilities to the three levels of government (question 1) without some discussion of role definition (question 2) and inclusion of certain aspects of new federalism (question 5) is virtually impossible. In the previous section on findings an attempt was made to avoid repetition. In this section repetition will be a calculated risk.

1. What are the respective responsibilities of each level of government to (a) assure every child a minimum level of educational opportunity, (b) upgrade the quality of education throughout the country, and (c) stimulate school systems to meet categories of national need?

The conclusions and recommendations regarding this question are based on the assumption that education is a matter of national concern, that it is a function of the state, and the operational responsibility resides at the local level. The fact that the political subdivision in our federal system which has the prime responsibility for education is the state has been reiterated many times in the literature, and courts have repeatedly held that local school districts are state agencies and its officers are state officers, not local officers. Despite this fact, most states do not act in this manner. They proceed as though education were a local function and that local communities are performing a local function, not a state function. Logically speaking, most states are abdicating their responsibility and are allowing local communities to carry out a state function as best they might. Serrano vs. Priest has pointed this out rather forcefully at least insofar as capturing and allocating financial resources is concerned. A more recent case, Bowman vs. the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, provides reinforcement and extension of the Serrano decision in that it is concerned not solely with the allocation of financial resources but with the provision of educational services to all children.

It seems, therefore, that states must assume responsibility legislatively if they do not wish the courts to do it judicially.

But what of the federal government? Responsibility of the federal government cannot be determined by analogy, since the constitution does not give the federal level powers in education. What has been done by the federal government has been accomplished under the protection of the general welfare clause, although this has not been determined judicially by the Supreme Court of the United States. Because education is not mentioned in the U. S. Constitution, there could be no judicial recognition of a compelling interest as is the case at the state level. The argument must turn, then on social and moral issues, not legal issues. A plethora of literature exists which supports the contention that the federal government does indeed have a compelling social interest in providing equal educational opportunity for its citizens ragardless of state of residence. No attempt will be made here to review this literature for reasons of economy of space and a desire not to belabor the obvious.

Consequently, it is difficult to separate the responsibilities of each level of government and indeed, under the concept of the new federalism, it is undoubtedly undesirable. The President's Commission on National Goals pointed out that federalism is a plan for sharing the functions of government and not a plan for separating them. The new notion of federalism calls for a sharing of the responsibility of carrying out an important public purpose and serving an important public interest which all three levels have in common and which none could achieve as well alone without the cooperation of the others. Despite the high degree of interdependency under the concept of new federalism, it is concluded that certain responsibilities can be assigned as "prime" responsibilities to each level.

The responsibilities of the federal government should be to:

(1) identify national goals and areas of critical need in education,

(2) provide substantial educational funding to the states in the form of general aid so as to make educational services more nearly equal between and within states,

(3) consolidate the many federal categorical aids into a few "block grants" consistent with the areas of critical need,

(4) complete the annual appropriations process in time to permit effective planning by state and local education agencies,

(5) assume primary responsibility for financing and coordinating research and development, and

(6) develop and help finance, in cooperation with state and local education agencies, a system of educational data and information collection.

For the purpose of implementing point 2 above, it is recommended that the President's Commission investigate the feasibility of an equalized matching approach to revenue sharing as proposed by Professor Erick Lindman. Professor Lindman has recommended this plan on previous occasions to other audiences and although modifications may be desirable, it is included in this report in answer to a request from the Commission staff for the project staff to include specific recommendations where appropriate and possible. The details of the equalized matching approach are to be found in Appendix C.

It is also concluded that state responsibilities are to:

(1) maintain a free public school system,

(2) set goals and objectives and provide appropriate evaluation of the accomplishments of these goals,

(3) require attendance at an educational institution of all children and youth between the ages of 6 and 16,

(4) insure that no child will be denied admission to any public school because of his race, religion, or ethnic origin,

(5) insure that all elementary and secondary schools maintain a program of instruction designed to meet the varying needs of all children and youth in the state,

(6) encourage innovation and development of new educational programs,

(7) provide for a uniform, comprehensive system of educational data and management information,

(8) provide improved evaluation and planning competency at the state level,

(9) assure adequate financial resources without excessive local tax burden, and

(10) complete the annual appropriation process in time for effective planning by local education agencies.

As a method of assigning and implementing the federal and state responsibilities (and as a basis for accountability), it is recommended that the President's Commission should consider the feasibility of implementing the "compact" as adopted by the Jackson Lake conference. The complete "compact" is exhibited in Appendix B.

It can be concluded that local responsibilities which are elements of the operational aspects of education are to:

(1) employ, assign and dismiss staff and negotiate contracts concerning salaries and employee benefits under general procedures established by law,

(2) plan, design and construct educational facilities,

(3) levy local or regional taxes to supply part of the operating and facilities costs (although if Serrano vs. Priest is upheld or if the concept of full state funding is adopted, this will be a minimal function),

(4) develop with local citizens the educational goals and objectives for each school area or region, and

(5) establish and implement procedures for periodic and systematic review of the scope and effectiveness of its education program, including evaluation of achievement versus preset goals and objectives.

It is further recommended that as a method of the identification of national goals and areas of critical need, that the President's Commission investigate the feasibility of implementing the formation of a national committee on educational policy development, which is discussed in more detail in the conclusions under question 6.

2. Can the role of each level of government be rationalized and generally accepted?

As the question is presently stated, the temptation is to simply answer "yes" or "no." To do so, however, would be to beg the question. We must assume that the roles of the three levels of government can be rationally defined and that these roles can receive general acceptance, even given the pluralistic nature of our society. The concept of the federal government playing one role with one state, another role with a second state, and yet another with a third state, is unthinkable. However, there are data collected during the course of the project which tend to lend support to this assumption, remembering that under the concept of new federalism roles and responsibilities cannot be uniquely assigned to the three levels.

As we look at the results of the questionnaire and of the conference, we note that informed people can, in general, agree on responsibilities and roles of the three levels of government. It is when structure is discussed that diversification appears. For instance, question S1 of the Questionnaire provides that the state should establish broad goals for public education, determine the resources required to attain these goals, and assure that the needed resources are available for schools in all parts of the state without excessive taxation. Ninety-seven percent of the respondents agreed and there were no definite exceptions when these responses are analyzed by region and by position. Even in question S2 which was concerned with maximum equalization of assurance of equal educational opportunity on the part of the state through definition of a standard program of educational services and the requirement that all public schools provide at least these services, there was 90% agreement. This, even in the case where staunch supporters of local control are likely to take violent exception to a standard program of educational services.

However, this agreement begins to break down in question S5 concerning to whom the state educational agency should be responsible, and definitely disintegrates in question S6 regarding how the state board of education should be chosen. Additionally, under the federal section, question F13a which is concerned with federal aid for public elementary and secondary schools as an equalizing process among states, 81% of the respondents agreed with this while on the other hand question F12 concerning decentralization into regional offices by the federal government showed much more diversity of opinion.

Conference participants were quite ready to agree with the basic concepts outlined in the "compact," but when the question arose of how state boards and chief state school officers should be appointed, a spirited debate resulted. It is apparent that informed people can agree on the ends to be achieved, but that the question of means is another matter. This difference will be discussed more fully in response to question 4.

It is recommended that the President's Commission on School Finance investigate the feasibility of the implementation of the "compact" adopted by the conference and the utilization of the National Committee on Educational Policy Development for the purpose of achieving a rationale for the assignment of roles and gaining general acceptance of these roles.

3. How can responsibility and accountability be applied at each level?

The concept of accountability is one which is likely to receive rather dramatic and increased emphasis in the years ahead. Because of the sparse input from the questionnaire and the conference, it is tempting here to review the growing body of literature in this field. However, it is assumed that project #10 relating to educational effectiveness and its relationship to educational finance will provide all of the necessary technical information in the field of accountability. Despite the realization that technical information from project #10 will be available to the Commission, it may be appropriate for the purposes of this report to list certain basic elements necessary to any system of accountability. The first necessary element is the presence of mutually agreed-upon goals. If the three levels of government are to work under any system of accountability, it is necessary that the goals -- that is, the desired results for which each level is responsible -- must be agreed upon and further, these results must be stated in measurable terms. Agreeing upon goals which cannot be measured may be good rhetoric, but it does not contribute to a system of accountability. Furthermore, the criteria by which the achievement of these goals is to be measured must be clearly stated and understood by all levels. It is also necessary that the conditions and constraints under which the goals are to be achieved are clearly understood by all parties. Reference is made once again to the suggested "compact" which was adopted by the conference with the recommendation that if it proves feasible to adopt such a "compact" that the responsibilities could be restated as goals with appropriate criteria to be developed.

4. What are the appropriate relationships between the executive (Governor, Mayor) and school boards, commissions, and chief state school officer?

This question is concerned with the structure of a state function and is controversial, to say the least. The results of the questionnaire were inconclusive. The conference generated much heat, and the vast body of literature in the field is conflicting. As was stated previously, it appears possible that general agreement can be reached concerning the responsibilities of each level of government and the role it is to play. However, when structure is discussed, diversity appears. The reader who wishes more detail on this matter is referred to the papers by Alan Campbell and Roald Campbell included in appendix B of the report. The question really revolves around the matter of relative independence of education from other governmental agencies.

As indicated in the summary of findings, people are generally supportive of the system of governance in which they presently find themselves. Each system has staunch supporters. What little research has been done in this area has been related to finances. These studies conclude that structure has very little correlation with the amount of resources that are received,per pupil expenditures, per capita expenditures, or per capita locally raised taxes for education. Virtually no research has been accomplished which would related end products with the type of governmental structure adopted by a particular state. The point here is that the important thing is to agree upon roles and responsibilities and to leave the means for accomplishing these goals up to individual states, which would no doubt result in much diversity. However, it is apparent that the Commission feels it is within its charge to make recommendations concerning structure and consequently, the following recommendations are made to the Commission.

1. Local school districts should be independent of city or county governments.
2. The state board of education should be appointed by the governor subject to confirmation by the senate.
3. The chief state school officer should be selected by the state board of education.

5. How can the concept of new federalism be applied to the educational field?

The concept of federalism demands that we look upon the governance of education as a total government system with a great interdependence among the subsystems rather than as three separate and distinct systems. Under this concept there is no way by which certain functions can be placed at any one of the three levels uniquely and be completely ignored by the other two levels.

Data gathered during the course of the project suggests that the concept of new federalism can be applied to the educational field and indeed must be applied. Once again, reference is made to the suggested "compact" as a vehicle for furthering federalism in the field of education. In the "compact" responsibilities are assigned and exhibit a certain degree of interdependence. Results of the questionnaire indicate general agreement that the federal government contribute to the support of education to a degree of approximately

30%. Reference is made once again to the plan submitted by Professor Erick Lindman which would provide for a federal contribution to be made to education.

It is recommended that the "compact," should it prove feasible to adopt, and with suitable modifications, would serve as a vehicle for accomplishing federalism in education.

6. Can a mechanism for incorporating the views of each level be established for educational policy development and for identification of national priorities?

Given the present state of widespread dissatisfaction, the plethora of proposed and implemented solutions to the problems in education at the federal, state and local levels, the obvious conclusion is, of course, that such a mechanism must be established.

It is recommended to the Commission that serious consideration be given to the formation of a national committee on educational policy development to which members would be appointed by the President, perhaps even with confirmation by the Senate. The members would be the best people to be found and would represent all three levels of government, as well as lay citizens and professional educators. It would be empowered to employ a small staff and would have the power to hold hearings on all aspects of education and would make periodic reports to the people, not just to the President, to the Congress, or to the profession. It would be concerned primarily with the development of national goals and policies, but its report to the people could also pinpoint the areas of critical need and recommend actions necessary to meet these needs at all three levels of government.

APPENDIX A

ECS

EDUCATION COMMISSION OF THE STATES
Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80203 — 303 - 255-3631

Similar letter sent to:

Governors
State House Education Committee Chairmen
State Senate Education Committee Chairmen
State Appropriations Committee Chairmen

June, 1971

The Education Commission of the States is cooperating with the President's Commission on School Finance by conducting a review of practices, attitudes and responses to new and old concepts which relate to the role of the local, state and federal governments and their overlapping responsibilities in the governance of education. The findings will become a part of the final report to the President.

The enclosed questionnaire is a part of the review. I am most hopeful that you will cooperate by completing it and returning it to ECS in the enclosed envelope. Let me hasten to assure you that neither the results of the questionnaire nor any individual response will be attributed to, reported on, or construed as a position of yourself or your office.

In addition, there will be a conference held in August to which will be invited governors, legislators and lay citizens concerned with education for the purpose of formulating a report to the President's Commission.

In the federal concept of government a redetermination on the roles of the three levels of government is of vital importance to the future of American Education. May I once again urge that you complete the questionnaire as soon as possible. You will, of course, receive a copy of the results when they are completed.

Sincerely,

Wendell H. Pierce

Wendell H. Pierce
Executive Director

WHP:mccdr

EDUCATION COMMISSION OF THE STATES
Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80203 — 303 - 255-3631

Similar Letter
Sent to presidents of:
STate PTA's
Chief State School Officers
State Boards of Education
STate Education Associations
State School Board Associations

June, 1971

The Education Commission of the States, under contract to, and on behalf of, President Nixon's Commission on School Finance, is conducting a project for the purpose of making recommendations to the President's Commission regarding roles and relationships of the three levels of government in the governance of education.

This questionnaire is one part of that project. Forrest Conner joins me in asking for your cooperation in completing the enclosed questionnaire and returning it to ECS as soon as possible in the enclosed envelope. You may be assured that neither the results of the questionnaire nor any individual item will in any way be construed as a position of your organization.

In addition, there will be a conference held in August to which some of you will be invited, along with other educators, governors, and legislators, for the purpose of formulating a report to the President's Commission.

Since a determination of the roles of the three levels of government is of vital importance to you as a superintendent, may I once again urge you to complete the questionnaire as soon as possible. You will, of course, receive a copy of the results.

Sincerely,

Wendell H Pierce

Wendell H. Pierce
Executive Director

WHP:vdr

Enclosures

ECS
EDUCATION COMMISSION OF THE STATES
Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80203 — 303 - 255-3631

Similar letter sent to
executive secretaries of:
National Education Association state affiliates
National School Board Association
state affiliates

June, 1971

The Education Commission of the States is conducting a project under contract to, and on behalf of, the President's Commission on School Finance. One of the activities of the project involves the completion of a questionnaire on Intergovernmental Relations and the Governance of Education. I am enclosing a sample of this questionnaire as well as a sample of the cover letter which has gone out to presidents of state affiliates of the AASA.

As you will note from the cover letter, Dr. Forrest Conner is urging these presidents to cooperate with the Commission by completing this questionnaire as soon as possible. Dr. Conner has requested that we send a sample of this letter and the questionnaire to the executive secretary in order that he may know what is being asked of his president, and, in fact, might be of assistance in urging him to complete the questionnaire as soon as possible.

We are hoping to obtain the serious and thoughtful opinion of a number of categories of respondents, of which one is the president of state affiliates of the American Association of School Administrators. You, as well as your president, will receive a compilation of the results as soon as it is completed.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Wendell H Pierce

Wendell H. Pierce
Executive Director

WHP:vdr

Reminder letter sent to
those who had not returned
questionnaire.

July 16, 1971

During the latter part of June you were sent a questionnaire from the Education Commission of the States as a part of a project being conducted for President Nixon's Commission on School Finance. We do not have a record of having received your response as yet.

We are scheduled to make a report to the President's Commission on August 4th and are very desirous of including your responses in the tabulation.

For your convenience, I have enclosed an additional copy of the original request. I would appreciate very much an early return of your response.

Sincerely,

Russell B Vlaanderen

Russell B. Vlaanderen
Director of Research

RBV:dr

Enclosures

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS AND THE GOVERNANCE OF EDUCATION

A Project of

THE EDUCATION COMMISSION OF THE STATES

Under Contract to

THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON SCHOOL FINANCE

Directions

In the body of the questionnaire, please make a check mark on the appropriate line to indicate your reaction to each item. In section IV, you are asked to identify yourself by name, position and address for followup purposes only. You will not be identified with your responses.

I. THE LOCAL ROLE IN EDUCATIONAL GOVERNANCE

1. While the goal-setting function for public education is appropriately shared by all three levels of government and by the people generally, the local educational agency is responsible for operating schools and should be given freedom to select the methods to attain established goals.

Agree 87%
Disagree 6%
Undecided 7%

2. Since local education agencies are becoming administratively and fiscally more dependent upon state government, they should not be dependent administratively or fiscally upon general city or county government.

Agree 70%
Disagree 23%
Undecided 7%

3. The local school tax rate proposed by the school board should be subject to a vote of the people in the school district.

Agree 42%
Disagree 50%
Undecided 8%

4. To assure coordination between public schools and other local governmental services, the public school system should be a department of city or county government responsible to the chief executive officer of the city or county.

Agree 6%
Disagree 89%
Undecided 5%

5. The local school board should have authority to employ, assign, and dismiss teachers under general procedures established by law.

Agree 96%
Disagree 2%
Undecided 2%

6. The local school board should negotiate with organizations representing its teachers and enter into contracts with them concerning:
    a. Salaries and fringe benefits — Yes 78% No 20% NR 2%
    b. Curriculum content — Yes 26% No 71% NR 3%
    c. Teaching procedures — Yes 30% No 67% NR 3%

7. To equalize school resources and local tax rates among school districts within a state, the local school property tax should be abolished and all school tax income should be derived from state and federal sources.

Agree 18%
Disagree 70%
Undecided 12%

8. To make school resources more nearly equal and, at the same time, preserve the fiscal basis for local control, the local school property tax should be retained:

   a. To pay part of the cost of programs required by the state — Yes 64% No 30% NR 6%
   b. To finance local supplementary programs — Yes 80% No 12% NR 8%
   c. To finance school building programs — Yes 63% No 27% NR 10%

9. To make local school systems responsive to local and parental concerns, school boards should be elected by the people.

Agree 90%
Disagree 6%
Undecided 4%

10. Large urban school districts should be decentralized so as to encourage participation in school affairs by parents and community leaders.

Agree 64%
Disagree 12%
Undecided 24%

11. The governing board of a local educational agency should establish a systematic procedure for periodic reviews of the scope and effectiveness of its educational program, and these reviews should be the basis for expanding, curtailing, or changing various programs.

Agree 98%
Disagree 1%
Undecided 1%

II. THE STATE ROLE IN EDUCATIONAL GOVERNANCE

1. The state should establish broad goals for public education, determine the resources required to attain these goals, and assure that the needed resources are available for schools in all parts of the state without excessive taxation.

Agree 97%
Disagree 2%
Undecided 1%

2. To assure maximum equalization of educational opportunity, the state should define a standard program of educational services and require all public schools to provide at least these services.

Agree 90%
Disagree 7%
Undecided 3%

3. To provide for the development of new educational programs and to test their effectiveness, the state should authorize optional supplementary programs and provide for their support jointly from state and local sources.

Agree 89%
Disagree 6%
Undecided 5%

4. The optional supplementary programs should be jointly financed by the state and the local school district, but the state should contribute a greater percent of the cost of such programs to school districts in which taxable wealth per pupil is below the state average.

Agree 88%
Disagree 5%
Undecided 7%

5. The state education agency should be responsible to: (check one)

   a. The state board of education — 80%
   b. The governor — 8%
   c. An elected state school superintendent — 9%

NR 3%

6. How should the state board of education be chosen? (check one)
   a. Appointed by the governor 49%
   b. Elected - non-partisan ballot 35%
   c. Elected - partisan ballot 5%
   d. Elected by local school board members 7%
   NR 4%

7. How should the chief state school officer be chosen? (check one)
   a. Appointed by state board of education 76%
   b. Appointed by the governor 10%
   c. Elected - partisan ballot 5%
   d. Elected - non-partisan ballot 7%
   e. Elected by local school board members 1%
   NR 1%

8. The state education agency should receive and administer all federal funds for public schools in accordance with state plans developed by the state and approved by the federal government.
   Agree 77%
   Disagree 15%
   Undecided 8%

9. The state should establish an overall education agency to coordinate all of its educational activities including elementary and secondary schools and institutions of higher learning.
   Agree 62%
   Disagree 25%
   Undecided 13%

10. The state education agency should provide evidence concerning the effectiveness of public school programs for the governor, the legislature, and the public.
   Agree 97%
   Disagree 1%
   Undecided 2%

11. The state should negotiate (or establish) a statewide salary schedule for teachers, and all public school teachers in the state should be paid in accordance with the state salary schedule.
   Agree 26%
   Disagree 57%
   Undecided 17%

III. THE FEDERAL ROLE IN EDUCATIONAL GOVERNANCE

1. The federal government should establish broad goals for public education, determine the resources required to attain these goals, and assure that the needed resources are available for education in each state.
   Agree 58%
   Disagree 33%
   Undecided 9%

2. There should be a Secretary of Education in the President's Cabinet.
   Agree 70%
   Disagree 16%
   Undecided 14%

3. The federal government should consolidate its numerous categorical aids for education into a few "block grants."
   Agree 73%
   Disagree 14%
   Undecided 13%

4. The federal government should assume full responsibility for welfare costs, freeing state and local funds for public school support.
   Agree 58%
   Disagree 24%
   Undecided 18%

5. The federal government should share its revenues with states and municipalities for general governmental purposes, including, but not limited to, education.
   Agree 72%
   Disagree 13%
   Undecided 15%

6. The federal government should contribute toward the cost of education for all children and youth, including those attending church-related and other non-profit schools.
   Agree 17%
   Disagree 70%
   Undecided 13%

7. The federal government should assume primary responsibility for financing and coordinating research and development for education.
Agree 58%
Disagree 31%
Undecided 11%

8. The federal government should aid states in financing retirement for public school teachers.
Agree 35%
Disagree 48%
Undecided 17%

9. There should be a national retirement system for public school teachers.
Agree 23%
Disagree 57%
Undecided 20%

10. As a condition for receiving federal general purpose grants-in-aid for public schools, the state should be required to adopt a plan which assures that all public schools in the state will be adequately supported.
Agree 72%
Disagree 15%
Undecided 13%

11. The federal government, in order to insure equality of opportunity regardless of the wealth of a student's parents, race, handicaps, or geographical location, should withdraw federal funds from districts not supplying this equality of opportunity.
Agree 57%
Disagree 24%
Undecided 19%

12. The U. S. Office of Education should decentralize its elementary and secondary school programs to regional offices.
Agree 49%
Disagree 22%
Undecided 29%

13. Federal aids for public elementary and secondary schools should be designed to:
    a. Equalize educational programs and services among states. Yes 81% No 16% NR 3%
    b. Equalize salaries of school employees among states. Yes 21% No 71% NR 8%
    c. Encourage state and/or local financial support for public schools by relating federal grants to school tax effort. Yes 78% No 16% NR 6%
    d. Make payments to school districts to compensate for federal tax exempt property Yes 88% No 8% NR 4%

14. The federal share of the cost of public schools should be increased (or decreased) until the federal contribution reaches an optimum of ________% of the total cost (insert preferred percent).

IV. RESPONDENT DATA

Name ____
(please print)

Position ____

Address ____
(street) (city) (state)

Please return this questionnaire to the Education Commission of the States, 1860 Lincoln Street, #300, Denver, Colorado 80203.

A TABULATION OF REPLIES TO THE GOVERNANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

BY REGIONS AND BY POSITION OF RESPONDENTS

Education Commission of the States

Denver, Colorado

I. THE LOCAL ROLE IN EDUCATIONAL GOVERNANCE

Question # L1: While the goal-setting function for public education is appropriately shared by all three levels of government and by the people generally, the local educational agency is responsible for operating schools and should be given freedom to select the methods to attain established goals. (Agree)

		Percent			
RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	A	D	U	N.R.
New England	40	83	10	7	0
Middle Atlantic	52	92	6	2	0
Great Lakes	39	90	5	5	0
Southeast	85	85	8	6	1
Plains	55	89	4	5	2
Southwest	27	81	11	4	4
Mountain	36	97	0	0	3
Far West	34	82	6	6	6
RESPONSES BY POSITION					
State Governor	33	82	6	9	3
State Legislator	86	74	13	12	1
Chief State School Officer	41	93	7	0	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	94	2	4	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	94	3	3	0
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	98	0	2	0
P.T.A Representative	40	93	5	0	2
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	84	8	0	8
Federal Official	14	100	0	0	0
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	87	6	5	2

Note:

A = Agree
D = Disagree
U = Undecided
N.R. = No Response

Question # L2: Since local education agencies are becoming administratively and fiscally more dependent upon state government, they should not be dependent administratively or fiscally upon general city or county government. (Agree)

		Percent			
RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	A	D	U	N.R.
New England	40	60	32	5	3
Middle Atlantic	52	63	27	10	0
Great Lakes	39	87	8	5	0
Southeast	85	55	35	7	3
Plains	55	83	13	4	0
Southwest	27	81	19	0	0
Mountain	36	67	22	8	3
Far West	34				
RESPONSES BY POSITION					
State Governor	33	82	12	3	3
State Legislator	86	68	30	1	1
Chief State School Officer	41	76	17	5	2
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	82	9	9	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	73	24	3	0
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	75	23	2	0
P.T.A Representative	40	52	30	15	3
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	64	30	3	3
Federal Official	14	28	36	36	0
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	70	23	6	1

Note:

A = Agree
D = Disagree
U = Undecided
N.R. = No Response

Question # L3: The local school tax rate proposed by the school board should be subject to a vote of the people in the school district. (Disagree)

		Percent			
RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	A	D	U	N.R.
New England	40	50	45	5	0
Middle Atlantic	52	29	61	10	0
Great Lakes	39	41	51	5	3
Southeast	85	48	41	10	1
Plains	55	24	71	5	0
Southwest	27	55	41	4	0
Mountain	36	44	50	6	0
Far West	34	50	38	6	6
RESPONSES BY POSITION					
State Governor	33	43	42	15	0
State Legislator	86	49	43	7	1
Chief State School Officer	41	29	69	2	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	26	67	7	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	34	66	0	0
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	44	47	9	0
P.T.A Representative	40	50	37	10	3
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	47	47	0	6
Federal Official	14	50	36	14	0
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	42	50	7	1

Note:

A = Agree
D = Disagree
U = Undecided
N.R. = No Response

Question # L4: To assure coordination between public schools and other local governmental services, the public school system should be a department of city or county government responsible to the chief executive officer of the city or county. (Disagree)

		Percent			
RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	A	D	U	N.R.
New England	40	15	75	8	2
Middle Atlantic	52	13	79	6	2
Great Lakes	39	3	92	0	5
Southeast	85	7	88	3	2
Plains	55	4	94	0	2
Southwest	27	0	100	0	0
Mountain	36	0	100	0	0
Far West	34	0	85	12	3
RESPONSES BY POSITION					
State Governor	33	3	88	9	0
State Legislator	86	8	85	4	3
Chief State School Officer	41	0	98	0	2
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	2	96	2	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	0	97	0	3
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	2	98	0	0
P.T.A Representative	40	7	80	8	5
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	6	92	0	2
Federal Official	14	50	36	14	0
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	6	89	3	2

Note:

A = Agree
D = Disagree
U = Undecided
N.R. = No Response

Question # L5: The local school board should have authority to employ, assign, and dismiss teachers under general procedures established by law. (Agree)

RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	A	D	U	N.R.
		Percent			
New England	40	95	2	3	0
Middle Atlantic	52	94	2	4	0
Great Lakes	39	95	5	0	0
Southeast	85	98	2	0	0
Plains	55	94	0	4	2
Southwest	27	100	0	0	0
Mountain	36	97	3	0	0
Far West	34	91	6	0	3
RESPONSES BY POSITION					
State Governor	33	97	0	3	0
State Legislator	86	95	4	1	0
Chief State School Officer	41	95	0	3	2
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	98	2	0	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	100	0	0	0
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	100	0	0	0
P.T.A Representative	40	93	5	2	0
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	89	8	0	3
Federal Official	14	93	0	7	0
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	96	2	1	1

Note:

A = Agree
D = Disagree
U = Undecided
N.R. = No Response

Question #L6a: The local school board should negotiate with organizations representing its teachers and enter into contracts with them concerning salaries and fringe benefits. (Yes)

RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	Yes	No	N.R.
New England	40	95	5	0
Middle Atlantic	52	94	6	0
Great Lakes	39	97	3	0
Southeast	85	48	47	5
Plains	55	82	16	2
Southwest	27	67	29	4
Mountain	36	89	11	0
Far West	34	82	15	3
RESPONSES BY POSITION				
State Governor	33	82	15	3
State Legislator	86	72	27	1
Chief State School Officer	41	73	22	5
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	83	17	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	72	28	0
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	72	26	2
P.T.A. Representative	40	77	20	3
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	97	0	3
Federal Official	14	100	0	0
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	78	20	2

N.R. = No Response

Question # L6b: The local school board should negotiate with organizations representing its teachers and enter into contracts with them concerning curriculum content. (No)

RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	Yes	No	N.R.
New England	40	32	68	0
Middle Atlantic	52	19	77	4
Great Lakes	39	28	69	3
Southeast	85	27	68	5
Plains	55	22	76	2
Southwest	27	18	78	4
Mountain	36	25	75	0
Far West	34	35	59	6
RESPONSES BY POSITION				
State Governor	33	33	64	3
State Legislator	86	27	71	2
Chief State School Officer	41	15	80	5
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin.	46	11	87	2
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	21	79	0
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	5	93	2
P.T.A. Representative	40	32	65	3
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	72	25	3
Federal Official	14	21	65	14
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	26	71	3

N.R. = No Response

Question #L6c: The local school board should negotiate with organizations representing its teachers and enter into contracts with them concerning teaching procedures. (No)

RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	Yes	No	N.R.
New England	40	35	65	0
Middle Atlantic	52	23	73	4
Great Lakes	39	31	67	2
Southeast	85	28	67	5
Plains	55	29	69	2
Southwest	27	29	67	4
Mountain	36	33	67	0
Far West	34	38	59	3
RESPONSES BY POSITION				
State Governor	33	42	55	3
State Legislator	86	32	66	2
Chief State School Officer	41	24	71	5
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	15	83	2
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	24	76	0
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	7	91	2
P.T.A. Representative	40	40	58	2
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	64	33	3
Federal Official	14	29	64	7
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	30	67	3

N.R. = No Response

Question # L7: To equalize school resources and local tax rates among school districts within a state, the local school property tax should be abolished and all school tax income should be derived from state and federal sources. (Disagree)

		Percent			
RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	A	D	U	N.R.
New England	40	23	68	7	2
Middle Atlantic	52	17	67	16	0
Great Lakes	39	18	77	5	0
Southeast	85	12	81	7	0
Plains	55	15	74	11	0
Southwest	27	15	59	22	4
Mountain	36	19	59	19	3
Far West	34	29	53	12	6
RESPONSES BY POSITION					
State Governor	33	15	76	3	6
State Legislator	86	20	67	11	2
Chief State School Officer	41	7	86	7	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	28	50	22	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	14	76	10	0
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	16	79	5	0
P.T.A Representative	40	17	62	21	0
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	17	77	3	3
Federal Official	14	14	50	36	0
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	18	70	11	1

Note:

A = Agree

D = Disagree

U = Undecided

N.R. = No Response

Question #L8a. To make school resources more nearly equal and, at the same time, preserve the fiscal basis for local control, the local school property tax should be retained to pay part of the cost of programs required by the state. (Yes)

RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	Yes	No	N.R.
New England	40	62	28	10
Middle Atlantic	52	61	27	12
Great Lakes	39	74	21	5
Southeast	85	71	20	9
Plains	55	80	20	0
Southwest	27	52	48	0
Mountain	36	61	39	0
Far West	34	32	62	6
RESPONSES BY POSITION				
State Governor	33	67	27	6
State Legislator	86	72	23	5
Chief State School Officer	41	73	20	7
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	48	48	4
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	76	21	3
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	63	35	2
P.T.A. Representative	40	60	37	3
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	56	33	11
Federal Official	14	57	14	29
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	64	30	6

N.R. = No Response

Question # L8b: To make school resources more nearly equal and, at the same time, preserve the fiscal basis for local control, the local school property tax should be retained to finance local supplementary programs. (Yes)

RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	Yes	No	N.R.
New England	40	70	25	5
Middle Atlantic	52	69	15	16
Great Lakes	39	90	3	7
Southeast	85	75	12	13
Plains	55	91	9	0
Southwest	27	89	11	0
Mountain	36	86	8	6
Far West	34	73	15	12
RESPONSES BY POSITION				
State Governor	33	79	12	9
State Legislator	86	79	13	8
Chief State School Officer	41	83	7	10
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin.	46	87	9	4
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	83	14	3
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	84	11	5
P.T.A. Representative	40	70	18	12
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	78	14	8
Federal Official	14	64	14	22
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	80	12	8

N.R. = No Response

Question # L8c: To make school resources more nearly equal and, at the same time, preserve the fiscal basis for local control, the local school property tax should be retained to finance school building programs. (Yes)

RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	Yes	No	N.R.
New England	40	28	65	7
Middle Atlantic	52	39	44	17
Great Lakes	39	82	18	0
Southeast	85	70	15	15
Plains	55	85	11	4
Southwest	27	81	19	0
Mountain	36	72	20	8
Far West	34	47	35	18
RESPONSES BY POSITION				
State Governor	33	70	18	12
State Legislator	86	64	24	12
Chief State School Officer	41	56	27	17
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	65	35	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	76	17	7
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	72	23	5
P.T.A. Representative	40	53	35	12
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	61	31	8
Federal Official	14	43	36	21
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	63	27	10

N.R. = No Response

Question #L9: To make local school systems responsive to local and parental concerns, school boards should be elected by the people. (Agree)

		Percent			
RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	A	D	U	N.R.
New England	40	97	3	0	0
Middle Atlantic	52	73	13	12	2
Great Lakes	39	95	3	2	0
Southeast	85	82	14	4	0
Plains	55	96	2	0	2
Southwest	27	100	0	0	0
Mountain	36	97	0	0	3
Far West	34	94	0	3	3
RESPONSES BY POSITION					
State Governor	33	91	3	3	3
State Legislator	86	90	8	1	1
Chief State School Officer	41	93	2	2	3
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	89	7	4	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	97	0	3	0
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	93	5	2	0
P.T.A Representative	40	90	8	2	0
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	86	11	0	3
Federal Official	14	72	7	21	0
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	90	6	3	1

Note:

A = Agree
D = Disagree
U = Undecided
N.R. = No Response

Question # L10: Large urban school districts should be decentralized so as to encourage participation in school affairs by parents and community leaders. (Agree)

		Percent			
RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	A	D	U	N.R.
New England	40	67	8	23	2
Middle Atlantic	52	71	11	12	6
Great Lakes	39	59	13	26	2
Southeast	85	58	15	23	4
Plains	55	60	14	26	0
Southwest	27	59	11	30	0
Mountain	36	78	6	14	2
Far West	34	65	9	20	6
RESPONSES BY POSITION					
State Governor	33	70	6	15	9
State Legislator	86	56	19	22	3
Chief State School Officer	41	56	12	29	3
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin.	46	78	4	18	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	52	17	31	0
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	60	12	28	0
P.T.A Representative	40	68	13	17	2
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	75	5	17	3
Federal Official	14	72	7	7	14
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	64	12	21	3

Note:

A = Agree
D = Disagree
U = Undecided
N.R. = No Response

Question # L11: The governing board of a local educational agency should establish a systematic procedure for periodic reviews of the scope and effectiveness of its educational program, and these reviews should be the basis for expanding, curtailing, or changing various programs. (Agree)

		Percent			
RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	A	D	U	N.R.
New England	40	95	3	0	2
Middle Atlantic	52	98	0	2	0
Great Lakes	39	100	0	0	0
Southeast	85	99	1	0	0
Plains	55	98	0	2	0
Southwest	27	100	0	0	0
Mountain	36	100	0	0	0
Far West	34	91	3	3	3
RESPONSES BY POSITION					
State Governor	33	100	0	0	0
State Legislator	86	94	2	2	2
Chief State School Officer	41	100	0	0	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	100	0	0	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	100	0	0	0
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	100	0	0	0
P.T.A Representative	40	98	2	0	0
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	97	0	0	3
Federal Official	14	93	0	7	0
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	98	1	1	0

Note:

A = Agree

D = Disagree

U = Undecided

N.R. = No Response

II. THE STATE ROLE IN EDUCATIONAL GOVERNANCE

Question #S1: The state should establish broad goals for public education, determine the resources required to attain these goals, and assure that the needed resources are available for schools in all parts of the state without excessive taxation. (Agree)

		Percent			
RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	A	D	U	N.R.
New England	40	100	0	0	0
Middle Atlantic	52	96	2	0	2
Great Lakes	39	97	3	0	0
Southeast	85	93	4	3	0
Plains	55	96	2	2	0
Southwest	27	96	4	0	0
Mountain	36	97	3	0	0
Far West	34	100	0	0	0
RESPONSES BY POSITION					
State Governor	33	94	3	3	0
State Legislator	86	93	5	1	1
Chief State School Officer	41	100	0	0	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	98	2	0	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	100	0	0	0
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	95	0	5	0
P.T.A Representative	40	95	5	0	0
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	100	0	0	0
Federal Official	14	100	0	0	0
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	97	2	1	0

Note:

A = Agree

D = Disagree

U = Undecided

N.R. = No Response

Question # S2: To assure maximum equalization of educational opportunity, the state should define a standard program of educational services and require all public schools to provide at least these services. (Agree)

		Percent			
RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	A	D	U	N.R.
New England	40	97	0	3	0
Middle Atlantic	52	92	4	2	2
Great Lakes	39	87	10	0	3
Southeast	85	91	6	3	0
Plains	55	93	5	2	0
Southwest	27	96	0	4	0
Mountain	36	80	14	6	0
Far West	34	82	18	0	0
RESPONSES BY POSITION					
State Governor	33	94	6	0	0
State Legislator	86	88	7	4	1
Chief State School Officer	41	90	5	5	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	91	7	2	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	86	10	4	0
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	88	9	3	0
P.T.A Representative	40	95	2	3	0
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	92	8	0	0
Federal Official	14	86	7	0	7
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	90	7	2	1

Note:

A = Agree

D = Disagree

U = Undecided

N.R. = No Response

Question # S3: To provide for the development of new educational programs and to test their effectiveness, the state should authorize optional supplementary programs and provide for their support jointly from state and local sources. (Agree)

		Percent			
RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	A	D	U	N.R.
New England	40	90	5	0	5
Middle Atlantic	52	90	2	8	0
Great Lakes	39	95	5	0	0
Southeast	85	90	5	5	0
Plains	55	84	9	7	0
Southwest	27	85	7	4	4
Mountain	36	89	6	5	0
Far West	34	88	9	3	0
RESPONSES BY POSITION					
State Governor	33	88	3	6	3
State Legislator	86	85	8	6	1
Chief State School Officer	41	95	0	5	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	80	11	9	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	90	7	3	0
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	95	5	0	0
P.T.A Representative	40	95	2	3	0
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	86	8	3	3
Federal Official	14	100	0	0	0
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	89	6	4	1

Note:

A = Agree
D = Disagree
U = Undecided
N.R. = No Response

Question # S4: The optional supplementary programs should be jointly financed by the state and the local school district, but the state should contribute a greater percent of the cost of such programs to school districts in which taxable wealth per pupil is below the state average. (Agree)

		Percent			
RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	A	D	U	N.R.
New England	40	87	7	3	3
Middle Atlantic	52	90	2	6	2
Great Lakes	39	97	0	3	0
Southeast	85	85	9	6	0
Plains	55	87	4	5	4
Southwest	27	85	0	11	4
Mountain	36	83	6	8	3
Far West	34	82	12	3	3
RESPONSES BY POSITION					
State Governor	33	85	9	3	3
State Legislator	86	89	5	5	1
Chief State School Officer	41	98	0	2	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	81	4	11	4
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	80	7	10	3
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	89	9	2	0
P.T.A Representative	40	90	5	5	0
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	83	8	6	3
Federal Official	14	86	0	7	7
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	88	5	5	2

Note:

A = Agree
D = Disagree
U = Undecided
N.R. - No Response

Question # S5: The state education agency should be responsible to: (check one)

(a) The state board of education (b) The governor

(c) An elected state school superintendent (State Board)

RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	State Board	Governor	Elect. State Sup't.	N.R.
New England	40	85	10	3	2
Middle Atlantic	52	73	23	0	4
Great Lakes	39	77	5	15	3
Southeast	85	82	4	8	6
Plains	55	83	2	13	2
Southwest	27	74	7	15	4
Mountain	36	78	3	19	0
Far West	34	79	9	6	6
RESPONSES BY POSITION					
State Governor	33	67	18	9	6
State Legislator	86	72	14	13	1
Chief State School Officer	41	73	2	20	5
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	91	0	7	2
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	100	0	0	0
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	95	0	5	0
P.T.A. Representative	40	78	3	7	12
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	78	8	11	3
Federal Official	14	57	36	0	7
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	80	8	9	3

N.R. = No Response

Question # S6: How should the state board of education be chosen? (check one)

a. Appointed by the governor
b. Elected -- non-partisan ballot
c. Elected -- partisan ballot
d. Elected by local school board members

(Governor)

RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	Appt'd. by Gov.	Elect. N.P.* Ballot	Elect. P.** Ballot	Elect. Local Board Memb.	N.R.
New England	40	77	15	0	5	3
Middle Atlantic	52	60	15	0	10	15
Great Lakes	39	41	41	10	0	8
Southeast	85	44	42	3	8	3
Plains	55	51	38	5	4	2
Southwest	27	33	56	11	0	0
Mountain	36	39	39	11	8	3
Far West	34	32	38	9	21	0
RESPONSES BY POSITION						
State Governor	33	70	18	9	0	3
State Legislator	86	61	24	7	5	3
Chief State School Officer	41	46	37	10	0	7
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	35	50	0	13	2
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	55	31	7	3	4
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	35	37	5	18	5
P.T.A. Representative	40	27	53	0	15	5
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	47	39	8	3	3
Federal Official	14	57	29	0	0	14
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	49	35	5	7	4

N.R. = No Response

*N.P. = Non Partisan

**P. = Partisan

Question #S7: How should the chief state school officer be chosen? (check one)

(a) Appointed by state board of education
(b) Appointed by the governor
(c) Elected -- partisan ballot
(d) Elected -- non-partisan ballot
(e) Elected by local school board members

(State Board)

RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	N.R.
New England	40	85	10	0	3	2	0
Middle Atlantic	52	67	25	0	2	0	6
Great Lakes	39	87	3	3	7	0	0
Southeast	85	74	8	6	8	2	2
Plains	55	82	7	2	9	0	0
Southwest	27	78	15	4	3	0	0
Mountain	36	70	0	19	8	0	3
Far West	34	70	12	9	9	0	0
RESPONSES BY POSITION							
State Governor	33	70	21	6	0	0	3
State Legislator	86	64	19	7	10	0	0
Chief State School Officer	41	81	2	2	12	0	3
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	91	0	2	7	0	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	90	3	3	4	0	0
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	81	2	7	5	5	0
P.T.A. Representative	40	78	8	5	7	2	0
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	83	8	6	3	0	0
Federal Official	14	43	36	0	0	0	21
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	76	10	5	7	1	1

N.R. = No Response

Question #S8: The state education agency should receive and administer all federal funds for public schools in accordance with state plans developed by the state and approved by the federal government. (Agree)

		Percent			
RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	A	D	U	N.R.
New England	40	75	17	5	3
Middle Atlantic	52	71	23	2	4
Great Lakes	39	87	8	5	0
Southeast	85	80	14	6	0
Plains	55	80	11	9	0
Southwest	27	70	19	11	0
Mountain	36	75	11	14	0
Far West	34	73	15	9	3
RESPONSES BY POSITION					
State Governor	33	79	9	12	0
State Legislator	86	79	8	11	2
Chief State School Officer	41	100	0	0	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin.	46	83	13	4	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	100	0	0	0
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	63	28	7	2
P.T.A Representative	40	72	20	8	0
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	58	31	11	0
Federal Official	14	36	50	7	7
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	77	15	7	1

Note:

A = Agree
D = Disagree
U = Undecided
N.R. = No Response

Question # S9: The state should establish an overall education agency to coordinate all of its educational activities including elementary and secondary schools and institutions of higher learning. (Agree)

		Percent			
RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	A	D	U	N.R.
New England	40	57	23	18	2
Middle Atlantic	52	77	11	12	0
Great Lakes	39	46	33	21	0
Southeast	85	67	21	11	1
Plains	55	60	31	9	0
Southwest	27	59	30	11	0
Mountain	36	58	25	17	0
Far West	34	56	32	12	0
RESPONSES BY POSITION					
State Governor	33	64	21	15	0
State Legislator	86	58	30	11	1
Chief State School Officer	41	54	34	12	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	67	20	13	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	41	38	21	0
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	65	26	9	0
P.T.A Representative	40	70	23	7	0
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	75	8	14	3
Federal Official	14	57	7	36	0
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	62	25	13	0

Note:

A = Agree
D = Disagree
U = Undecided
N.R. = No Response

Question #S10: The state education agency should provide evidence concerning the effectiveness of public school programs for the governor, the legislature, and the public. (Agree)

		Percent			
RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	A	D	U	N.R.
New England	40	97	0	3	0
Middle Atlantic	52	96	0	4	0
Great Lakes	39	100	0	0	0
Southeast	85	98	2	0	0
Plains	55	93	0	5	2
Southwest	27	93	4	3	0
Mountain	36	100	0	0	0
Far West	34	94	6	0	0
RESPONSES BY POSITION					
State Governor	33	88	6	6	0
State Legislator	86	98	0	1	1
Chief State School Officer	41	95	0	5	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	96	2	2	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	100	0	0	0
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	95	5	0	0
P.T.A Representative	40	97	0	3	0
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	100	0	0	0
Federal Official	14	100	0	0	0
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	97	1	2	0

Note:

A = Agree
D = Disagree
U = Undecided
N.R. = No Response

Question # S11: The state should negotiate (or establish) a statewide salary schedule for teachers, and all public school teachers in the state should be paid in accordance with the state salary schedule. (Disagree)

		Percent			
RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	A	D	U	N.R.
New England	40	30	47	23	0
Middle Atlantic	52	25	48	23	4
Great Lakes	39	23	54	20	3
Southeast	85	41	46	12	1
Plains	55	7	76	17	0
Southwest	27	22	63	11	4
Mountain	36	17	75	8	0
Far West	34	29	53	18	0
RESPONSES BY POSITION					
State Governor	33	27	61	12	0
State Legislator	86	38	49	12	1
Chief State School Officer	41	24	71	5	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	24	52	24	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	21	52	27	0
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	16	63	16	5
P.T.A Representative	40	25	52	23	0
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	22	64	11	3
Federal Official	14	7	50	36	7
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	26	57	16	1

Note:

A = Agree
D = Disagree
U = Undecided
N.R. - No Response

III. THE FEDERAL ROLE IN EDUCATIONAL GOVERNANCE

Question #F1: The federal government should establish broad goals for public education, determine the resources required to attain these goals, and assure that the needed resources are available for education in each state. (Agree)

		Percent			
RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	A	D	U	N.R.
New England	40	72	23	5	0
Middle Atlantic	52	58	31	9	2
Great Lakes	39	67	20	10	3
Southeast	85	55	40	4	1
Plains	55	53	33	9	5
Southwest	27	67	18	15	0
Mountain	36	44	50	6	0
Far West	34	56	38	3	3
RESPONSES BY POSITION					
State Governor	33	54	40	3	3
State Legislator	86	42	48	9	1
Chief State School Officer	41	61	32	5	2
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	72	24	4	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	38	52	7	3
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	65	23	10	2
P.T.A Representative	40	75	15	10	0
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	67	25	5	3
Federal Official	14	64	22	7	7
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	58	33	7	2

Note:

A = Agree
D = Disagree
U = Undecided
N.R. = No Response

Question #F2: There should be a Secretary of Education in the President's Cabinet. (Agree)

		Percent			
RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	A	D	U	N.R.
New England	40	82	10	8	0
Middle Atlantic	52	58	17	23	2
Great Lakes	39	77	8	15	0
Southeast	85	68	19	11	2
Plains	55	67	20	13	0
Southwest	27	78	7	15	0
Mountain	36	58	31	11	0
Far West	34	85	9	6	0
RESPONSES BY POSITION					
State Governor	33	61	24	15	0
State Legislator	86	50	33	16	1
Chief State School Officer	41	81	7	12	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	83	6	9	2
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	65	14	21	0
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	74	12	14	0
P.T.A Representative	40	92	5	3	0
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	94	6	0	0
Federal Official	14	21	29	43	7
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	70	16	13	1

Note:

A = Agree
D = Disagree
U = Undecided
N.R. = No Response

Question # F3: The federal government should consolidate its numerous categorical aids for education into a few "block grants." (Agree)

		Percent			
RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	A	D	U	N.R.
New England	40	65	17	15	3
Middle Atlantic	52	75	15	6	4
Great Lakes	39	69	10	16	5
Southeast	85	70	18	12	0
Plains	55	80	9	11	0
Southwest	27	78	15	7	0
Mountain	36	80	6	14	0
Far West	34	65	15	20	0
RESPONSES BY POSITION					
State Governor	33	82	18	0	0
State Legislator	86	70	14	16	0
Chief State School Officer	41	88	7	5	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	74	9	17	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	79	14	7	0
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	72	14	9	5
P.T.A Representative	40	65	15	20	0
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	58	19	20	3
Federal Official	14	71	14	0	15
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	73	14	12	1

Note:

A = Agree
D = Disagree
U = Undecided
N.R. = No Response

Question # F4: The federal government should assume full responsibility for welfare costs, freeing state and local funds for public school support. (Agree)

		Percent			
RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	A	D	U	N.R.
New England	40	60	30	10	0
Middle Atlantic	52	60	15	21	4
Great Lakes	39	69	15	16	0
Southeast	85	53	24	22	1
Plains	55	47	35	16	2
Southwest	27	59	26	15	0
Mountain	36	61	19	20	0
Far West	34	65	23	12	0
RESPONSES BY POSITION					
State Governor	33	70	21	9	0
State Legislator	86	68	20	12	0
Chief State School Officer	41	54	22	24	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	63	17	15	5
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	38	21	41	0
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	61	23	16	0
P.T.A Representative	40	52	32	16	0
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	50	36	14	0
Federal Official	14	29	29	28	14
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	58	24	17	1

Note:

A = Agree
D = Disagree
U = Undecided
N.R. = No Response

Question #F5: The federal government should share its revenues with states and municipalities for general governmental purposes, including, but not limited to, education. (Agree)

		Percent			
RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	A	D	U	N.R.
New England	40	72	12	13	3
Middle Atlantic	52	84	6	8	2
Great Lakes	39	77	13	10	0
Southeast	85	67	11	21	1
Plains	55	71	13	12	4
Southwest	27	67	22	11	0
Mountain	36	72	14	14	0
Far West	34	70	21	6	3
RESPONSES BY POSITION					
State Governor	33	79	12	9	0
State Legislator	86	65	19	13	3
Chief State School Officer	41	83	7	10	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	63	13	24	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	66	14	17	3
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	77	9	14	0
P.T.A Representative	40	75	18	5	2
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	75	8	17	0
Federal Official	14	93	0	0	7
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	72	13	13	2

Note:

A = Agree

D = Disagree

U = Undecided

N.R. - No Response

Question # F6: The federal government should contribute toward the cost of education for all children and youth, including those attending church-related and other non-profit schools. (Disagree)

RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	A	D	U	N.R.
		Percent			
New England	40	25	57	18	0
Middle Atlantic	52	34	56	8	2
Great Lakes	39	20	72	8	0
Southeast	85	7	78	14	1
Plains	55	5	80	13	2
Southwest	27	7	71	22	0
Mountain	36	19	70	11	0
Far West	34	23	73	4	0
RESPONSES BY POSITION					
State Governor	33	30	37	30	3
State Legislator	86	18	66	16	0
Chief State School Officer	41	12	78	10	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	6	85	9	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	31	66	3	0
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	11	84	5	0
P.T.A Representative	40	7	77	16	0
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	8	86	3	3
Federal Official	14	64	14	15	7
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	17	70	12	1

Note:

A = Agree

D = Disagree

U = Undecided

N.R. = No Response

Question # F7: The federal government should assume primary responsibility for financing and coordinating research and development for education. (Agree)

		Percent			
RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	A	D	U	N.R.
New England	40	77	12	8	3
Middle Atlantic	52	65	27	6	2
Great Lakes	39	51	41	8	0
Southeast	85	55	34	11	0
Plains	55	53	40	7	0
Southwest	27	63	18	19	0
Mountain	36	47	42	8	3
Far West	34	56	26	18	0
RESPONSES BY POSITION					
State Governor	33	58	24	15	3
State Legislator	86	45	42	12	1
Chief State School Officer	41	71	27	2	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	67	24	9	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	38	48	14	0
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	56	35	9	0
P.T.A Representative	40	70	20	10	0
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	61	28	11	0
Federal Official	14	79	14	0	7
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	58	31	10	1

Note:

A = Agree
D = Disagree
U = Undecided
N.R. - No Response

Question # F8: The federal government should aid states in financing retirement for public school teachers. (Disagree)

RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	Percent A	Percent D	Percent U	Percent N.R.
New England	40	45	37	18	0
Middle Atlantic	52	33	48	17	2
Great Lakes	39	33	49	18	0
Southeast	85	37	47	15	1
Plains	55	27	64	9	0
Southwest	27	30	48	22	0
Mountain	36	33	53	14	0
Far West	34	41	38	18	3
RESPONSES BY POSITION					
State Governor	33	36	46	18	0
State Legislator	86	26	56	18	0
Chief State School Officer	41	41	49	10	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	41	37	20	2
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	24	66	10	0
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	23	68	9	0
P.T.A Representative	40	28	43	27	2
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	72	22	6	0
Federal Official	14	29	43	21	7
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	35	48	16	1

Note:

A = Agree

D = Disagree

U = Undecided

N.R. = No Response

Question # F9: There should be a national retirement system for public school teachers. (Disagree)

		Percent			
RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	A	D	U	N.R.
New England	40	35	47	18	0
Middle Atlantic	52	19	56	19	6
Great Lakes	39	25	49	26	0
Southeast	85	14	64	20	2
Plains	55	27	69	4	0
Southwest	27	22	52	26	0
Mountain	36	25	61	14	0
Far West	34	27	41	29	3
RESPONSES BY POSITION					
State Governor	33	15	64	21	0
State Legislator	86	15	70	13	2
Chief State School Officer	41	22	58	20	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin.	46	37	37	22	4
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	14	62	24	0
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	7	79	14	0
P.T.A Representative	40	30	42	25	3
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	53	33	14	0
Federal Official	14	21	43	29	7
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	23	57	18	2

Note:

A = Agree

D = Disagree

U = Undecided

N.R. = No Response

Question # F10: As a condition for receiving federal general purpose grants-in-aid for public schools, the state should be required to adopt a plan which assures that all public schools in the state will be adequately supported. (Disagree)

	No.	A	D	U	N.R.
		Percent			
RESPONSES BY REGION					
New England	40	77	10	10	3
Middle Atlantic	52	75	8	15	2
Great Lakes	39	69	15	13	3
Southeast	85	68	19	12	1
Plains	55	64	20	7	9
Southwest	27	78	15	7	0
Mountain	36	72	20	8	0
Far West	34	82	9	3	6
RESPONSES BY POSITION					
State Governor	33	67	18	9	6
State Legislator	86	64	20	13	3
Chief State School Officer	41	76	17	2	5
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	87	4	9	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	59	10	28	3
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	74	19	5	2
P.T.A Representative	40	80	18	2	0
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	78	11	8	3
Federal Official	14	57	7	29	7
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	72	15	10	3

Note:

A = Agree
D = Disagree
U = Undecided
N.R. = No Response

Question # F11: The federal government, in order to insure equality of opportunity regardless of the wealth of a student's parents, race, handicaps, or geographical location, should withdraw federal funds from districts not supplying this equality of opportunity. (Agree)

		Percent			
RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	A	D	U	N.R.
New England	40	62	17	18	3
Middle Atlantic	52	79	10	9	2
Great Lakes	39	51	23	26	0
Southeast	85	45	35	18	2
Plains	55	47	25	22	6
Southwest	27	52	37	11	0
Mountain	36	56	25	19	0
Far West	34	70	15	12	3
RESPONSES BY POSITION					
State Governor	33	70	18	12	0
State Legislator	86	43	30	23	4
Chief State School Officer	41	49	39	10	2
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	54	20	24	2
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	48	38	10	4
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	61	23	16	0
P.T.A Representative	40	70	18	10	2
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	70	8	22	0
Federal Official	14	72	7	14	7
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	57	24	17	2

Note:

A = Agree
D = Disagree
U = Undecided
N.R. = No Response

Question # F12: The U.S. Office of Education should decentralize its elementary and secondary school programs to regional offices. (Agree)

		Percent			
RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	A	D	U	N.R.
New England	40	55	17	28	0
Middle Atlantic	52	40	23	35	2
Great Lakes	39	43	26	31	0
Southeast	85	52	21	26	1
Plains	55	43	33	24	0
Southwest	27	56	15	29	0
Mountain	36	47	22	28	3
Far West	34	56	12	32	0
RESPONSES BY POSITION					
State Governor	33	70	6	21	3
State Legislator	86	53	13	34	0
Chief State School Officer	41	24	56	20	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	59	28	13	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	45	24	31	0
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	49	9	42	0
P.T.A Representative	40	48	25	25	2
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	42	22	36	0
Federal Official	14	36	21	36	7
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	49	22	28	1

Note:

A = Agree
D = Disagree
U = Undecided
N.R. = No Response

Question #F13a: Federal aids for public elementary and secondary schools should be designed to equalize educational programs and services among states. (Yes)

RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	Yes	No	N.R.
New England	40	92	8	0
Middle Atlantic	52	90	8	2
Great Lakes	39	74	23	3
Southeast	85	79	16	5
Plains	55	76	22	2
Southwest	27	92	4	4
Mountain	36	72	28	0
Far West	34	79	15	6
RESPONSES BY POSITION				
State Governor	33	79	21	0
State Legislator	86	76	23	1
Chief State School Officer	41	90	5	5
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	85	15	0
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	83	17	0
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	67	26	7
P.T.A. Representative	40	85	8	7
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	92	8	0
Federal Official	14	93	0	7
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	81	16	3

N.R. = No Response

Question #F13b: Federal aids for public elementary and secondary schools should be designed to equalize salaries of school employees among states. (No)

RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	Yes	No	N.R.
New England	40	23	70	7
Middle Atlantic	52	10	81	9
Great Lakes	39	15	85	0
Southeast	85	29	59	12
Plains	55	22	74	4
Southwest	27	33	63	4
Mountain	36	11	83	6
Far West	34	21	56	23
RESPONSES BY POSITION				
State Governor	33	18	76	6
State Legislator	86	20	69	11
Chief State School Officer	41	15	80	5
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	37	59	4
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	21	76	3
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	5	86	9
P.T.A. Representative	40	23	65	12
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	39	56	5
Federal Official	14	0	79	21
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	21	71	8

N.R. = No Response

Question # F13c: Federal aids for public elementary and secondary schools should be designed to encourage state and/or local financial support for public schools by relating federal grants to school tax effort. (Yes)

RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	Yes	No	N.R.
New England	40	73	25	2
Middle Atlantic	52	81	10	9
Great Lakes	39	87	10	3
Southeast	85	79	14	7
Plains	55	75	16	9
Southwest	27	74	26	0
Mountain	36	75	19	6
Far West	34	76	15	9
RESPONSES BY POSITION				
State Governor	33	85	15	0
State Legislator	86	67	20	13
Chief State School Officer	41	78	20	2
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	83	15	2
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	79	17	4
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	72	23	5
P.T.A. Representative	40	75	13	12
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	92	5	3
Federal Official	14	93	0	7
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	78	16	6

N.R. = No Response

Question #F13d: Federal aids for public elementary and secondary schools should be designed to make payments to school districts to compensate for federal tax-exempt property. (Yes)

RESPONSES BY REGION	No.	Yes	No	N.R.
New England	40	78	15	7
Middle Atlantic	52	83	13	4
Great Lakes	39	90	8	2
Southeast	85	94	2	4
Plains	55	89	7	4
Southwest	27	96	0	4
Mountain	36	89	11	0
Far West	34	85	6	9
RESPONSES BY POSITION				
State Governor	33	94	3	3
State Legislator	86	81	11	8
Chief State School Officer	41	90	7	3
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin	46	91	7	2
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	29	90	7	3
State School Board Member (NASBE)	43	91	7	2
P.T.A. Representative	40	90	8	2
Pres. State Teachers' Assoc. (NEA)	36	94	3	3
Federal Official	14	71	22	7
TOTAL RESPONSES	368	88	8	4

N.R. = No Response

Question # F14: The federal share of the cost of public schools should be increased (or decreased) until the federal contribution reaches an optimum of ____% of the total cost. (Insert preferred percent.)

RESPONSES BY REGION	No. of Responses	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
New England	29	38%	25%	75%
Middle Atlantic	38	33	10	66
Great Lakes	30	28	0	50
Southeast	60	34	8	100
Plains	42	28	0	50
Southwest	18	36	20	60
Mountain	21	28	0	50
Far West	24	36	0	70
Column Medians		33%	4%	63%

RESPONSES BY POSITION	No. of Responses	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
State Governor	26	30%	8%	50%
State Legislator	52	31	0	75
Chief State School Officer	33	31	10	50
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Admin.	38	34	0	50
Pres. State Assoc. of Sch. Boards	18	25	0	50
State School Board Member (NASBE)	30	34	2	70
P.T.A. Representative	24	38	10	100
Pres. State Teachers'Assoc. (NEA)	34	37	25	75
Federal Official	7	28	15	40
COLUMN MEDIANS		32%	10%	50%

APPENDIX B

STATE OF DELAWARE
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT
DOVER

RUSSELL W. PETERSON
GOVERNOR

Sent to selected list.

Letters sent out after
July 9 were written over
Governor Robert Scott's
signature (N.C.), new
chairman of ECS

July 2, 1971

The Education Commission of the States is conducting a special project for the President's Commission on School Finance. This project is known as Intergovernmental Relations and the Governance of Education and is intended to probe problems and issues in education as they relate to the interrelationships of federal, state and local governments in their educational endeavors.

As a part of this project, there will be a conference held at Jackson Lake Lodge, Wyoming, August 9, 10 and 11 for the purpose of bringing together a select, diverse group of people responsible for and interested in education, including federal officials, governors, legislators, educators and lay citizens. Because of your demonstrated interest, knowledge and background in the field of education finance and as one who is vitally concerned with its future in America, it is my pleasure as Chairman of the Education Commission of the States to extend to you an invitation to attend this conference.

Funds are available for the project to pay all of your expenses, and the billing procedure at the Lodge is such that we can also extend this invitation to your spouse at no cost for lodging. Transportation and meals for your spouse must, necessarily, be at your expense.

It is intended that the meeting will begin at approximately 3 p.m. on the 9th and adjourn at 12 noon on the 11th. This schedule will allow ample leeway for those of you who will be coming by air transportation. Frontier Airlines has a number of direct flights from both Denver and Salt Lake City to Jackson Hole.

For the purposes of logistics and planning time, may I urge you to make your decision concerning your attendance at this conference known as soon as possible to Dr. Russell B. Vlaanderen, Director of Research, ECS, 1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300, Denver, Colorado 80203.

Sincerely,

Russell W. Peterson

Russell W. Peterson, Chairman
Education Commission of the States

RWP:vdr

EDUCATION COMMISSION OF THE STATES
300 Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80203 — 303 - 255-3631

ATTENDANCE LIST

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS AND THE GOVERNANCE OF EDUCATION, a project of the Education Commission of the States under contract to the President's Commission on School Finance. Conference at Jackson Hole, Wyoming, August 9-11, 1971.

D - Delegate   P - President's Commission   C - Consultant   S - ECS Staff

D Dr. Richard E. Ando, President
Hawaii State Board of Education
Post Office Box 2360
Honolulu, Hawaii 96804

D The Honorable Reubin Askew
Governor of Florida
State Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

D The Honorable Manny S. Brown
State Representative
State Capitol
Madison, Wisconsin 53702

D The Honorable Gilbert Bursley
State Senator
State Capitol
Lansing, Michigan

C Dr. Alan Campbell
Professor of Political Science and
Dean of the Maxwell Graduate School
of Citizenship and Public Affairs
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13210

C Dr. Roald Campbell
Fawcett Professor of Educational
Administration
Ohio State University
29 West Woodruff Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210

D Mr. Robert Cavanaugh
President, Pennsylvania Federation
of Teachers
1930 Chestnut Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

D Mr. James M. Connor
Chairman, State Board of Education
P. O. Box 544
Kingstree, South Carolina 20556

C Mr. Earl Denton
c/o Dr. Erick Lindman
1397 Monument Street
Pacific Palisades, California 90272

S Mr. Clifford Dochterman
Director of Public Relations
ECS

D Mr. William J. Edgar
Superintendent of Schools
Havemeyer Building
P. O. Box 292
Greenwich, Connecticut 06830

P Mr. James Falcon
Project Monitor
President's Commission on School Finance
1016 Sixteenth Street, NW
Washington, D. C. 20036

D The Honorable Charles Grassley
State Representative
Rural Route 1
New Hartford, Iowa 14850

D Dr. Byron Hansford
Executive Secretary
Council of Chief State School Officers
1201 Sixteenth Street, NW
Washington, D. C. 20036

D Dr. Georgianna Hardy
President
California School Boards Association, Inc.
450 North Grand Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90054

D Dr. Ernest W. Horn
President
Indiana State Teachers Association
420 Pleasant Ridge Road
R. R. 12, Box 6
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

P Mr. Norman Karsh
Executive Director
President's Commission on School Finance
1016 Sixteenth Street, NW
Washington, D. C. 20036

D The Honorable Thomas Laverne
State Senator
State Capitol
Albany, New York 12224

C Dr. Erick Lindman
Professor of Education, UCLA
1397 Monument Street
Pacific Palisades, California 90272

D Mr. Robert H. McBride
President, State Board of Education
1500 Spring Lane
Wilmington, Delaware 19801

S Mr. Robert McCall
Deputy Director, ECS

D Mr. Paul A. Miller
Superintendent of Schools
230 East 9th Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

D The Honorable Mary L. Nock
State Senator
P. O. Box 488
Salisbury, Maryland 21801

D Mr. James Phelps
Office of the Governor
State Capitol
Lansing Michigan 48903

D Mrs. B. Glenn Prentice
President, New Mexico PTA
8109 Connecticut, N. E.
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87110

D Dr. Wayne O. Reed
Associate Commissioner for
Federal-State Relations, USOE
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, D. C. 20202

S Mrs. Doris Ross
Secretary to Dr. Vlaanderen
ECS

D Dr. Paul B. Salmon
Executive Secretary
American Association of School
Administrators
1201 Sixteenth Street, NW
Washington, D. C. 20036

D Dr. William J. Sanders
Commissioner of Education
State Office Building
P. O. Box 2219
Hartford, Connecticut 06115

D Mr. Charles B. Saunders, Jr.
Deputy Commissioner of Education
for External Relations
USOE
400 Maryland Avenue
Washington, D. C. 20202

D Mrs. Robert G. Scholze
President
Pennsylvania PTA
424 Wedgewood Drive
Lower Burrell, Pennsylvania 15068

D Mrs. Helen B. Ure
Chairman, State Board of Education
3105 Imperial Street
Salt Lake City, Utah 84106

S Dr. Russell B. Vlaanderen
Director of Research, ECS

D Mr. A. Terry Weathers
President, New York State School Boards
Association
315 Staples Street
Farmingdale, New York 11735

D Dr. Harold V. Webb
Executive Director
National School Boards Association
1233 Central Street
Evanston, Illinois 60201

D Mrs. George E. White
President, Kentucky PTA
4405 Church Street
Covington, Kentucky 41015

D Mr. Norval D. Wildman
President
Idaho School Trustees Association
First Federal Savings and Loan
P. O. Box 970
Burley, Idaho 83318

D Miss Lois Wilson
New York State Teachers Association
152 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12210

D Dr. John O. Wilson
Assistant Director
Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation
OEO
1200 19th Street, NW
Washington, D. C. 20506

D Mr. Robert H. Woodruff
Superintendent, School District 5
216 North G. Street
Aberdeen, Washington 98520

dr
8/18/71

ECS

EDUCATION COMMISSION OF THE STATES
Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80203 — 303 - 255-3631

MEMORANDUM

TO: Conference Participants

FROM: Russell B. Vlaanderen, Director of Research

DATE: July 30, 1971

SUBJECT: Intergovernmental Relations and the Governance of Education Conference at Jackson Lake Lodge, Wyoming, August 9-11, 1971

Thank you for accepting the invitation of the Education Commission of the States to attend the conference on Intergovernmental Relations and the Governance of Education. I am sure that your presence, your ideas, and your suggestions will contribute materially to the report which ECS will present to the President's Commission on School Finance.

Enclosed are an agenda and a general information sheet. All other materials will be issued at the conference. I am looking forward to working with you.

RBV:dr

Enclosures

EDUCATION COMMISSION OF THE STATES
Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80203 — 303 - 255-3631

Conference on

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS AND THE GOVERNANCE OF EDUCATION

A Project of
The Education Commission of the States

under contract to
The President's Commission on School Finance

August 9-11, 1971 Jackson Lake Lodge, Wyoming

GENERAL INFORMATION

Dress: Dress for all occasions will be informal, in keeping with the relaxed Western atmosphere of Jackson Hole. Coats and ties may be worn, but they certainly are not obligatory.

Meals: The Monday evening banquet is the only organized meal function. All other meals may be eaten in the dining room at your convenience.

Expenses: The conference budget will cover all meals, lodging, and transportation for official delegates. Meals for spouses should be paid by each individual (except the banquet). There will be no separate charges for room accomodations for spouse. Delegates' meals and lodging may be signed to the conference master account by writing "ECS Master Account" after your signature.

Administration: Any questions about the program or arrangements should be directed to:

Dr. Russell B. Vlaanderen
Director of Research
Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80203
(303) 893-5200

CONFERENCE MATERIALS

Conference materials may be picked up in Room C on Monday, August 9, 2:00 to 4:00 p.m.

RBV:dr
7/28/71

EDUCATION COMMISSION OF THE STATES
Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80203 — 303 - 255-3631

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS AND THE GOVERNANCE OF EDUCATION

A Project of ECS under Contract to

THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON SCHOOL FINANCE

August 9-11, 1971 Conference Jackson Lake Lodge, Wyo.

August 9

4:00	Orientation and Review of Conference Objectives, Room C Dr. Erick Lindman, Professor of Education, UCLA
5:00	Free
6:30	Cocktail Reception (spouses invited)
7:30	Banquet (spouses invited)

August 10

8:00	Breakfast -- on your own
9:00	General Session -- Background Information Room C -- Presentations by: * Dr. Alan Campbell, Professor of Political Science and Dean of the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University, New York * Dr. Roald Campbell, Fawcett Professor of Educational Administration at Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio
10:30	Group Meetings
12:00	Lunch -- on your own
1:30-5:00	Group Meetings continued
	Dinner -- on your own

August 11

9:00	Group Meetings
10:00	General Session -- Reports and Discussion
12:00	Adjournment

RBV:dr 7/28/71

AMERICAN FEDERALISM AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Erick L. Lindman

Responsibilities assigned to each level of government, and to units within those levels in the American Federal system, are continuously changing. These changes are usually due to (1) an expansion of the role of government, bringing with it additional duties to be assigned to existing governmental agencies, or (2) a search for more effective governmental services by transferring functions from one level or unit to another.

Both of these factors are present in recent efforts to re-allocate educational responsibilities among the three levels of government. The scope of educational services offered at public expense is increasing, and so is the number of years of schooling of each succeeding generation of students. This expansion, both in the scope of educational services and in the number of students served, leads inevitably to problems in the allocation of additional responsibilities among the three levels of government.

If there were general satisfaction with the present leadership and legal control of public schools, the problem would be essentially one of raising additional money. Unfortunately, the money-raising problem is complicated by widespread dissatisfaction with the effectiveness of public schools, leading to a tendency to search for greater effectiveness by transferring control of school programs to different levels of government.

The legal structure of America's public schools reflects a belief that responsibility for levying school taxes can be lodged at the state or Federal level, while control of public schools remains local. This proposition, basic to arguments for state and Federal general support for locally-controlled public schools, has lost much of its support during recent years because of persistent criticism of the effectiveness of public schools. This lack of confidence in public schools has led to greater program controls, exercised through categorical aids, for selected facets of the public school program.

Under these conditions, control of public schools is likely to gravitate to the level of government which has the greatest capacity to levy and collect taxes. While capacity to raise money is one factor which should be considered in reassigning educational responsibilities to each level of government, there are three others which are important:

1. Its historic role in the field of education.
2. Its aptitude for discharging educational functions.
3. Its dependence upon education for discharging its non-educational function.

The division of educational responsibilities between local and state governments is well established and need not be repeated here -- except to point out that state governments, over the years, have accepted more and more responsibility for public school operation and finance.

The Federal role, however, is changing. Early in the history of the Republic, national leaders were enthusiastic advocates of the cause of education, but responsibility for action was generally left to the states. Over the years, however, Federal action became more specific. In addition to advocating better education, the Federal Government has sought to compensate, in various ways, for deficiencies in the school tax base. The original public school land grants provided the nest egg for state support for local public schools. More recently, Federal aid to Federally-affected school districts sought to compensate for deficiencies in the school tax base caused by Federal ownership of tax-exempt property.

Another type of Federal participation in public education began with the enactment of the Morrill Act in 1862, providing land grants for state colleges of agriculture and mechanical arts. This first of the categorical aids had a two-fold purpose: (1) To aid the states in establishing state colleges of agriculture and mechanical arts; and (2) To aid the Federal Government by strengthening agriculture and training officers for the U.S. Army.

Most subsequent categorical aids sought to aid the states in financing some facet of education which aided the Federal Government in achieving a national goal. Thus, Federal aid for vocational education aids state-financed public schools to broaden their curricula and also aids the Federal Government in pursuing its goal of full employment.

In addition to grants-in-aid to improve selected facets of education, the Federal Government has contributed funds for the education of individuals for whom it accepts responsibility. Illustrations of this type of school aid are funds for the education of native Indian children and for the G. I. Bill. Under such a program, the Federal Government does not seek to aid selected school programs, or compensate for deficiencies in the school tax base. Instead, it recognizes an obligation to a person. This form of Federal aid for education is often regarded as precedent for the voucher plan, since the aid is directed to a person and not to an educational institution.

Still another form of Federal aid to education seeks to improve the methods and technology of education. The 1867 Act, creating the U.S. Office of Education, directed it to diffuse "such information respecting the organization and management of schools and school systems, and methods of teaching as shall aid the people of the United States in the establishment of efficient school systems, and otherwise promote the cause of education." Although this legislative mandate is more than one-hundred years old, only in recent years has the Federal Government provided significant amounts of money and specific authorization for research and development work to aid the people of the United States in the establishment of efficient school systems. This role for the Federal Government has received increased acceptance in recent years, partly because widespread criticism of public schools has indicated a need for improvement, and partly because it would be an obvious duplication of effort for each school district, or each state, to research problems of common concern to all school districts and all states.

To summarize, Federal activities in the field of education have been designed to accomplish five purposes:

1. To improve selected facets of the educational program, especially those programs and services which contribute directly to national goals, such as full employment.
2. To educate individuals for whom the Federal Government accepts responsibility.
3. To improve the methods and technology of education.
4. To compensate for deficiencies in the school tax base.
5. To finance suitable school programs for all children and youth.

With few exceptions, the Federal Government has sought to accomplish these purposes without directly operating schools or colleges. It has, instead, used an increasing number of grants-in-aid. Conditions imposed upon the use of these funds has led, in some instances, to "role conflicts" with state and local governments.

The Local-State-Federal partnership for education requires a cooperative arrangement in which each partner assumes responsibilities consistent with its special strengths. This is, of course, the goal to be sought. But for the partnership to be effective, there must be ground rules for cooperation.

To develop such ground rules, it is necessary to identify rather precisely the difficulties encountered by each partner, especially by the local school agency which must accept contributions from the other two partners and create a functioning educational system.

Partnership Problems

Local school boards and their administrative staffs have expressed concern about "federal crash programs" descending upon them without time to prepare budgets, to find space, or employ specialized personnel. They have also been concerned about maintaining a balanced educational program in their communities in the face of fiscal incentives to divert resources to Federally-aided activities. They have been concerned about staff time devoted to writing proposals and preparing reports for Federal agencies. Although the impact of the Federal program has been positive, the need for better ground rules for cooperation among the three partners has become increasingly evident.

For the partnership to operate effectively, the complex gears of the Federal Government must be meshed with the educational machinery of 50 different states and 20,000 local school districts. Fortunately, some Federal activities supporting elementary and secondary education present no serious coordination problems. Federally-sponsored research and development activities, for example, often may proceed at the pace and in the manner the Federal Government chooses without disrupting state and local public school programs (although recent requests for information for research purposes have taxed the meager fact-gathering facilities of many school systems). Similarly, schools operated for Indian children by the Federal Government require only general coordination with state and local public school programs. But joint financial arrangements between the Federal Government and a state or local school district require close coordination.

The Matching Dilemma

Federal contributions to local school districts for special educational programs, such as vocational education, often require the state or local school district to match the Federal contribution on a dollar-for-dollar basis. The matching requirement adds a very important element in the public school partnership. It assures the Federal Government that state and local authorities believe the program is worthy and are willing to pay part of its cost. In a sense, a special program matched by Federal funds is offered to local school boards at half price, providing a bargain, but not a gift. While a gift horse is not looked in the mouth, a bargain is usually examined more carefully by the purchaser.

Moreover, a local contribution toward the cost of a special educational program financed in part from Federal funds provides a fiscal basis for local control. If the local school board has a financial interest in the economical operation of the program, the Federal interest is protected without imposition of excessive program controls. Such an arrangement tends to promote efficient management.

Finally, the matching requirement promotes continued local and state tax effort for the support of public education. Indeed, one of the concerns about Federal participation in financing public education is a fear that, in the long run, local and state taxation for public schools will dry up, removing this vital element from our public school system.

While these effects of the matching requirement are worthy, other effects of matching are not. For low-income states, or for school districts with below-average taxable resources, the matching requirement presents a special problem. They must either forgo Federal payments, divert funds from some other essential programs, or increase the school tax rate, which often is excessive already. Under these conditions, Federal payments for new expanded programs, requiring local matching funds, are likely to go to the more wealthy school districts, or to the more wealthy states, which are in a better position to provide the matching funds.

One approach to the solution of this problem is the use of "equalized matching" ratios in which less wealthy states are given a more favorable Federal matching ratio. Under this arrangement, low-income states may be required to contribute only 50 cents, or 25 cents, for each dollar of Federal funds they receive. While the equalized matching plan avoids the most serious weakness of the matching requirement, a basic question remains with respect to Federal programs designed to broaden the scope of public school service: If states are in need of increased school tax revenue to improve the quality of the ongoing program, should they be encouraged to divert funds from this purpose to provide matching funds for a new, often expensive, program of special interest to the Federal Government? Should this priority question be decided upon the basis of the inherent value of the competing programs unaffected by fiscal incentives?

This adverse effect of matching is avoided when the "equalized matching" plan is used for general support purposes. Such a plan, properly administered, does not place undue hardship upon low-wealth states and school districts, and does not introduce a fiscal incentive to divert limited local school funds from other essential programs. But it does effectively prevent a reduction in state and local tax effort for the support of public schools.

Administrative Coordination

Each state has its own education code, its own school district system, and its own budget and fiscal procedures for public schools. Although there are many similarities among the states, there are also many differences. In some states, school districts are large in area, coinciding with counties; in others, there are many one-room school districts, each an independent administrative and taxing unit. In some states, rigid limitations are imposed upon the taxing power of local school districts. In others, limitations are less rigid. In most states, school budgeting procedures are prescribed by law, and a definite schedule is established for planning, for public review, and for final adoption of the annual budget by the school board.

Federal "crash programs" inevitably create confusion. Even established programs, such as aid to Federally-affected public schools under Public Law 874, interfere with efficient school budgeting procedures if Congressional approval of appropriations is delayed until August or September, after most school districts are required by law to adopt their budgets. Effective participation by the Federal Government in the public school partnership requires respect for the budget controls and procedures established by states for the efficient management of public schools and a realistic appreciation of the time needed to put a program into operation after the funds have been made available for it.

Federal funds granted directly to local school districts, bypassing the state departments of education, often create problems among the three partners. Frequently the state and Federal Government grant funds to local school districts for similar purposes. Under Public Law 874, payments are made to Federally-affected school districts to compensate them for deficiencies in the property tax base that.result from the tax-exempt status of Federally-owned property. In most states, these same local school districts receive state "equalization" or "foundation program" funds to compensate for deficiencies in the school property tax base. The

Federal contribution and the state contribution to the local school districts are for similar or overlapping purposes.

A similar problem occurs when both the state and Federal Government provide aid to a local school districts for the same special purpose. For example, some states have provided state aid to local school districts for "remedial" or "compensatory" education. With the enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the Federal Government embarked upon a program of aiding local school districts for similar purposes. A question immediately arises: Should the state discontinue or curtail its program for the disadvantaged and transfer the funds to other equally important areas of instruction, for example, education of the gifted?

Perhaps in anticipation of this possibility, a provision was incorporated into Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 which states: "No payments shall be made under this title for any fiscal year to a State which has taken into consideration payments under this title in determining the eligibility of any local education agency in that State for State aid, or the amount of that aid...." The Federal Government, in effect, has told the state that in considering the needs of the local school districts for state funds, the state must ignore Federal funds available to the school districts under this title. The Federal partner by such action interferes with the efforts of the state partner to discharge its budget-balancing responsibility.

The Budget-Balancing Contribution

In many school districts, the total amount of the annual budget determines the local school tax rate. Under these conditions, the power to determine the overall school budget is also the power to determine the school tax rate. In this process, all anticipated income, including state and Federal aids, is deducted from the total approved expenditure budget, and the difference is raised from local property taxation.

Responsibility for making the budget-balancing contribution is usually associated with authority to determine the total expenditure budget. Traditionally, this has been a local responsibility. In some instances, this authority rests with the board of education; in others, the power to approve the overall school budget (and the responsibility for making the budget-balancing contribution) rests with the City Council, or the County Court. In still other instances, a town meeting, or referendum, is required.

Although traditionally this is a local function, in many states during recent years this function has shifted de facto to the state. This shift has occurred because local school districts have reached state imposed tax rate limitations. School districts levy the maximum tax rate allowable by law and then the state legislature decides if additional funds are needed.

Any reassignment of responsibilities among the three partners requires careful consideration of the locus of the final budget-balancing responsibility. The Federal Government should not be assigned the budget-balancing responsibility for local school districts. This responsibility should be shared between the local educational agency and the state.

If the local contribution is discontinued, and all school funds come from state and Federal sources, the budget-balancing responsibility would be transferred in its entirety to the state. Such a change would fundamentally alter local responsibility for public schools. Local budget review procedures would become meaningless, and effective presentation of school needs to state authorities would become the mark of a good school superintendent.

It is difficult to anticipate what such a change would do to public schools. Would the schools become less responsive to local needs and conditions? Would parental participation in the teaching process decrease? Would state uniformity bring greater equality of educational opportunity -- and, at the same time, discourage local innovation?

These questions cannot be answered easily, but they reflect widespread concern about shifting the budget-balancing responsibility entirely to the state level, and suggest that this responsibility should be shared, in some way, between the state and the locality.

Purposes and Payment Procedures

Nearly every Federal education program, or proposal, can be classified under one of the five general purposes shown in the accompanying chart. These purposes reflect congressional intent and indicate purposes which have been regarded as appropriate to the Federal role in education.

Most of the recently-enacted Federal categorical aid programs are intended "to improve selected facets of the educational program." This group includes the vocational education programs, major portions of the National Defense Education Act, and the Elementary & Secondary Education Act of 1965, and many others.

Another type of Federal education program is intended to educate individuals for whom the Federal Government accepts responsibility. Illustrations of this type of program include education of native Indian children, education for veterans, as well as operation of schools in foreign countries for dependents of American personnel stationed abroad. In these instances, the Federal concern is for the individual rather than for a specific curriculum.

Still another accepted Federal purpose is to improve the methods and technology of education. This purpose was stated in the 1867 Act creating the U.S. Education Agency and is the basis for the extensive research and development program in education financed from Federal funds during the past decade.

A completely different purpose is found in Federal education programs and proposals designed to compensate for deficiencies in the school tax base. Included in this category are various payments-in-lieu-of-taxes, including aid to Federally affected areas, as well as proposals to provide Federal "equalization" payments to low-income states.

The fifth purpose, to assure adequate schooling for all children and youth, is closely related to the fourth. If the provision of adequate schooling for all children and youth were purely a fiscal problem, a Federal program designed to compensate for deficiencies in the school tax base would do the job. However, if the Federal Government defines "adequate schooling" to include compensatory education, if needed, to assure that all high school graduates have a salable skill and to assure that unnecessary segregation is avoided, the Federal program would require more than payments to compensate for deficiencies in the school tax base.

No type-five program has been enacted into law. Perhaps no single program could accomplish such a broad national goal, and the fifth purpose will ultimately be achieved by a combination of programs designed to accomplish the first four purposes.

After the purpose of a program has been defined, it is necessary to consider alternative ways to accomplish the stated purpose of the program. In the accompanying chart, five payment plans have been indentified. The problem, of course, is to select the payment procedure which is most effective in accomplishing the purpose of the program, consistent with the role of each level of government in the public school partnership.

Consider the problem of fostering the development of vocational education in secondary schools and junior colleges. The goal is to be sure that every person has a salable skill. Which of the five payment procedures would be most effective in accomplishing this goal?

Should funds for this purpose be apportioned among the states on the basis of a census of high school and post-high school age groups, with the stipulation that the funds be used for vocational education and that states and/or local school districts contribute a like amount for vocational education classes? Essentially, this is the payment plan for the present Federal program, and it has worked reasonably well -- but would a different payment plan be more effective?

Under the second payment plan, each state or local school district would be paid in proportion to the number of students enrolled in, or graduated from, vocational education programs. Such a plan has a built-in incentive to enroll more students in courses designed to develop salable skills. In that sense, this Federal payment would be a payment for services rendered to students.

Under the third plan, it would be necessary to identify the amount expended for vocational education in each state each year. This amount would then be multiplied by a reimbursement percentage to determine the Federal contribution. The reimbursement percentage would be inversely related to the per capita income of a state, so that low-income states would receive a greater percentage reimbursement from Federal sources. Under this plan, there would be a Federal-state-local partnership in paying the bill for vocational education.

Under the fourth plan, the Federal Government would contract with school systems or private agencies to provide specified types and kinds of vocational education. The contracts could be based upon costs incurred, or upon placement performance. This plan would require the Federal Government to pay the entire cost of a program, but it would exercise greater control over services rendered.

Finally, Federally owned and operated vocational schools could be established, as needed, throughout the nation. Under such a plan, control and responsibility for getting results would be placed in a Federal agency.

Each of these five methods of payment is worthy of consideration. Moreover, if the cost is to be shared between the Federal Government and the states, a cost-sharing plan must be developed. There are two basic approaches to cost sharing:

(1) A deducted state contribution representing equal tax effort for all states; or,

(2) A state percentage contribution inversely related to the state's per capita income or to some other measure of its taxpaying ability.

These two approaches to cost sharing have been discussed adequately in other publications. It will be noted, however, that under the deducted state contribution plan, a rigid cost limitation must be established, while under the percentage cost-sharing plan the total cost could be more flexible, since the Federal contribution would be a percentage of the actual cost.

The five payment procedures illustrated in the chart emphasize different measures of need: (1) A census of various age groups, (2) the number of students enrolled in a program, and (3) the amount a state spends for a program. The chart also emphasizes varying degrees of Federal supervision and control. Under a census apportionment plan, Federal supervision is minimal. Under the contract or direct operation plan, Federal supervision is greatest.

The choice of a payment plan should be based upon two considerations: (1) Is the plan based upon a sound concept of Federal-state-local relations, and (2) will the plan be effective in accomplishing the national purpose?

PURPOSES AND PAYMENT PROCEDURES FOR FEDERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

PURPOSE OF FEDERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM	PAYMENT PROCEDURE				
	PAYMENTS BASED ON CENSUS	PAYMENTS PER STUDENT SERVED	EQUALIZED MATCHING GRANTS	CONTRACTED EDUCATIONAL SERVICES	FEDERALLY OPERATED PROGRAMS
	1	2	3	4	5
I. TO IMPROVE SELECTED FACETS OF THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM					
II. TO EDUCATE INDIVIDUALS FOR WHOM FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ACCEPTS RESPONSIBILITY					
III. TO IMPROVE METHODS AND TECHNOLOGY OF EDUCATION					
IV. TO COMPENSATE FOR DEFICIENCIES IN THE SCHOOL TAX BASE					
V. TO FINANCE SUITABLE SCHOOL PROGRAMS FOR ALL CHILDREN & YOUTH					

SHARED RESPONSIBILITIES FOR THE GOVERNANCE OF EDUCATION

For American Federalism to operate effectively in the field of education, each level of government -- federal, state, and local -- must accept specific responsibilities and obligations and assure the American people that these obligations will be met in a satisfactory manner. An essential step in the development of educational federalism is general agreement concerning responsibilities and obligations which should be accepted by each level of government.

While the allocation of responsibilities between the state and its local educational agencies differs from state to state, the division of responsibilities between the Federal Government and the states reflects a common national policy in the governance of education. This policy needs to be clarified. The following statement of mutual obligations that the states and the Federal Government should accept with respect to education is presented as the basis for study to facilitate discussion of the problem.

Each state should assure its people and the Federal Government that:

1. It will maintain a free public school system providing at least twelve years of instruction.

2. No child will be denied admission to any public school because of his race or religion.

3. School policies will foster, whenever possible, inter-racial school programs and racially-integrated schools.

4. All children between the ages of 7 and 16 will be required to attend a suitable school for at least 175 days each year.

5. All high school or junior college graduates will be prepared to enter a four-year college and/or have a cluster of practical skills useful in the search for employment.

6. The accomplishments of public schools will be evaluated and reported to the public.

7. Adequate financial resources will be available for public schools in all parts of the state without excessive local taxation.

8. The state education agency will maintain an effective research and planning service.

The Federal Government should assure the American people and the respective states that:

1. Federal funds for public schools will be granted to states and administered by state education agencies under federally-approved state plans.

2. Annual federal appropriations for public schools will be completed in time to permit effective planning by state and local educational agencies.

3. Federal categorical aids will be consolidated into a few "block grants."

4. An adequate research, development, and dissemination program, seeking to solve educational problems of common concern to all states, will be maintained.

5. Federal funds for education will supplement state and local funds so as to make educational services more nearly equal among states.

6. Federal "effort requirements" will encourage continued state and local support of public schools without imposing excessive burdens upon low-income or high-cost states.

7. Payments will be made to public schools where substantial amounts of federal tax-exempt property is located, and no penalties will be imposed upon states which count federal payments in lieu of taxes and PL 874 funds as available local funds in computing state equalization or foundation program payments to local school districts.

The above statements describing federal and state (including local) roles in the field of elementary and secondary education are intended to suggest responsibilities which should be assigned explicitly in a federal-state "compact" for education.

Such a "compact" should be expanded to include specific federal and state obligations for various federal programs in the field of education. For example, in the field of vocational education, the Federal Government should agree to provide for public schools in each state specified amounts of money each year, as well as projections of the kinds of beginning jobs likely to be available in each state. The state education agency should agree to expend these funds, along with specified amounts of state and local funds, for vocational education programs designed to prepare students for available jobs.

The effectiveness of a federal-state education compact requires a carefully-designed federal grant-in-aid program. Such a program would need to include some general support (or revenue sharing) funds, as well as funds earmarked for specific purposes. The latter should include block grant programs based upon consolidations of present categorical grants-in-aid.

Many categorical aids have been directed at segments of the curriculum. Perhaps greater educational returns per federal dollar expended could be obtained if some federal funds were earmarked for the operation of public schools during the summer months. Such a program could lead to productive use of the school plant during the summer months, without specifying which school subjects should be taught.

Another special purpose contribution could be made to protect retirement annuities of teachers and school administrators who move from one state to another. For example, the Federal Government might reimburse a state teachers' retirement system for the extra cost incurred for granting out-of-state experience credit to school teachers and administrators who move into a state after serving several years in the public schools of another state. This role for the Federal Government is consistent with its broader role in the general field of retirement allowances.

Other specific roles for the Federal Government in the field of education may be suggested. A "compact" spelling out federal and state roles in the field of education would, undoubtedly, change from year to year, but a definition of the respective obligations of the federal and state governments in the field of education is long overdue.

THE GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURE OF EDUCATION:

WHAT DIFFERENCE DOES IT MAKE?

by

Alan K. Campbell, Dean
Maxwell Graduate School
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York

Presented to

Conference on

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS AND THE GOVERNANCE OF EDUCATION

A Project of

The Education Commission of the States
under contract to
The President's Commission on School Finance

Jackson Lake Lodge, Wyoming   August 10, 1971

Governmental Reorganization

American political scientists and civic historians have produced a vast and rich literature on the question of the proper organization of government.(1) They have focused their concern on the appropriate organization of local government emphasizing issues like the elected chief executive, versus the appointed city manager; whether representatives within cities should be elected at large or by wards; and, periodically, the reorganization of government at the state and federal levels.

More generally, the reforms include both institutional and governmental process recommendations: the council manager plan, legislative proportional representation, the small council, non-partisan and at-large elections, professionalism, the separation of policy determination from its administration, and centralized executive responsibility. Indeed, these reform proposals have been described as the only original contribution of American scholars and civic reformers to the art and science of government.

Reform remains a live issue in American politics whether the emphasis is on local governments with reformers attempting to respond to current demands for both neighborhood governments and regional units, or at the state level with continuing emphasis on increasing the executive control of the governor, or the very recently announced Presidential proposals for reorganization of the executive departments of the national government. This penchant and enthusiasm for reform and reorganization is sometimes interpreted as a technique used by politicians to avoid significant substantive issues, or that hidden within the reform and reorganization recommendations are substantive implications politically unwise to discuss openly.

There is, in fact, a substantial difference of opinion as to the interrelationship between government structure and the substantive policy outcomes of governmental decision-making. There is a body of thought which suggests that structure is irrelevant, that the substance of government policy is a product of basic socio=economic factors which are uninfluenced by the structural system through which decisions are made. In face, in recent years, political scientists have been somewhat concerned with whether what goes on in the "little black box" -- i.e. the political process -- makes any difference at all.(2) The overpowering significance of socio-economic variables has tended to hide whatever significance the internal political process may possess.

A variant of this argument is the suggestion that structure itself is a product of the distribution of political power, and therefore simply serves the interest of those politically powerful. In this version, structure is important but responds to the same kinds of socio-economic forces as do the policy decisions of government. Changing structure will according to this argument have an impact on policy, but only because the socio-economic factors which influence policy are simultaneously affecting structural arrangements.

Finally, there are those who claim that structure has independent importance. Structure, it is claimed, determines at least the amount of accountability which governmental leaders have, the degree of visibility which government possesses, and finally the extent to which it can be democratically controlled. It is against these kinds of criteria that most structural reforms are judged.

The most obvious and important criticism that can be directed against the argument favoring structure, is that structure tends to lag behind the need for changes in social policy. Because of this lag characteristic, structure acts as an obstacle to the responsiveness of government.

Political Scientists, Educators and Government Structure

Although political scientists and students of education, with notable exceptions in both groups, have tended to agree that structure is important, they have disagreed as to what the structural relationship between education and the rest of government ought to be. Political scientists have argued for a clearcut hierarchical organizational system for government, with education as a part of that total structure. Their justification is based on a belief that this kind of system provides visibility and accountability, encourages the rational allocation of resources among functions of government, and brings to all activities of government the advantages of the partisan political process as a means by which the citizenry divides resources among functions of government. This belief has caused most political scientists to argue against special status for any single activity of government. Separate and autonomous units for education are strongly opposed. In contrast, the education community generally supports such autonomy. Arguments in support of this position include: a claimed uniqueness for education, unique because it deals with children, and the often special constitutional status of education making it a state function. As a state function it should have, it is claimed, its own governmental system rather than being mixed with other local functions.

Because of these characteristics, education should not be contaminated, it is stated, with partisan politics which are pictured as being corrupt, based on patronage and inconsistent with the necessary professionalism of educator.(3)

It can, of course, be argued and sometimes is, that this emphasis by the educational community on the uniqueness, and therefore need for autonomy for education, is a useful political argument which often produces an increase in the resources allocated to their function. This argument recognizes that education and politics are inevitably intermixed but that perpetuating the myth of the nonpolitical character of education is simply a tried and true technique to improve education's position in the political process. As one scholar suggested, "A political myth which is contrary to fact may serve a group best in a political struggle when: (1) the group which created it uses it, (2) others have come to believe it, and (3) the group does not itself believe in it as a description of reality."(4) When these conditions change, then it is quite possible that maintaining the myth will no longer serve the function -- i.e. produce desired policy or, better said, revenue outcomes.

What difference does it make?

Although the argument between political scientists and educators about the wisdom of the special status for education has been with us for a long time, it has not really been a meaningful empirical discussion. Rather, most of the debate has focused on arguments from general principles rather than actual scholarly attempts to measure the question of what difference does separating the government of education from general government make. Fortunately, in recent years, a number of research studies about the performance of the education function which are beginning to ask and tentatively answer the question, "What difference does it make?"

There are a number of dimensions of the "What difference does it make?" question which must be answered before we are going to be able to make definitive decisions on which policy may be based.

Such research should explore more thoroughly than it has to date:

> The relationship of the structural organization of education at all levels of government to the quality of educational services provided to the clients of the system.
>
> The impact of these structural arrangements on the role of the community, particularly the community which comprises the immediate clients of the system. Of particular importance in this regard is the relationship between the role of the so-called educational professionals to the non-professionals, whether they be students or parents.

> The importance of the division of education decision-making among the levels of government with emphasis on the impact of the higher levels, i.e., federal and state government, on the local school district.
>
> The inter-relationship between structure and the amount of resources allocated to education as compared to other functions of government, and its impact on the allocation to different kinds of school districts, particularly city, suburban and rural.
>
> The impact of intergovernmental flows of funds. Do such state and federal funds increase the total resources applied to education, or are they simply replacive of what otherwise would be provided locally? What role does intergovernmental aid play in equalizing educational opportunity?

While current research findings do not provide answers to all of these questions, there are a number of aspects of the structural situation in education to which research has been directly pointed. It is these aspects of the structural issues on which I will now report. The issues to be covered are: (1) the significance of independence; (2) the impact of non-education expenditures on education expenditures; (3) the role of state aid and the role of federal aid; and finally a discussion of the relevance of the findings to some of the current issues in the education field, with particular emphasis on the issues embodied in the relationship of the governing structure of education to its financing.

Independence: Asset or Liability

Perhaps the issue about which there has been the greatest debate is the relative autonomous status of school districts in the total state-local governmental system. Although the degree of autonomy varies substantially from one district to another, the myth of keeping education out of politics provides a kind of autonomy. This is true even in the case of a dependent school district, co-terminous with another unit of local government, and which has a school board appointed by the chief executive of that local unit.

Efforts have been made to measure the actual significance of independence by trying to determine if this characteristic results in education receiving more resources than would otherwise be the case. A number of careful analytical studies have been made of this factor and their general conslusion is that it probably does not make any difference. The researchers placed school districts on a continuum from complete independence to complete dependence and then measured the districts' position on that continum against the amount of resources they received.(5) The findings of a number of scholars were that the amount of resources received are much more determined by other factors than by this one. In fact, only very minor significance for independence has been found by this measurement technique.

In addition, scholars have found that the degree of independence does not result in any significant educational fiscal output. Neither do per student expenditures, or per capita expenditures, or per capita locally-raised taxes for education show any significant difference relative to independence. There are other aspects of the independence characteristic which may indeed have significance for the way the education function is performed. Directly related to independence is the so-called "no politics" characteristic of this function. Although it is clear that the claim of "no politics" is incorrect, because education as a public function is a part of the political process, the claim itself can still influence the nature of the political environment which surrounds the function.

One scholar who has devoted attention to this issue argues that the "no politics" characteristic means:

> . . . conflict over public school question lacks a sustaining structure. This means that instead of there being opposition to the established order at all times, just because that is how the system works, there is opposition only when there is something to oppose. Again specific issues sometimes ideological tend to be the motivating force. The consequence of this situation

> is not only that demands are focused on specifics . . . but also that the authority system is not usually accustomed to being opposed, and therefore it lacks resilience. Conflict is likely to come to it as a disorganizing shock, whereas, in most democratic government, structured conflict is recognized as the way the game is played. In school government, it often seems to be regarded as a rude and foreign intrusion.(6)

The periodic "crisis character" of the governance of education results in changes coming to this function only after heated community controversy. The controversy is then usually settled by the school board replacing the superintendent, normally hiring one from outside the system who responds to the issue which created the crisis in the first instance.(7)

Another characteristic of the independence of school governance is the separation of the resource raising activity from the similar activity of more general governments. Very often the raising of resources for education is done by public referendum, or separate votes on the school budget. In almost all instances, the raising of capital is done through a referendum process. Many educators have argued that this technique of raising funds for education has produced its favored position in the competition for resources. It is quite possible that historically this has been true, but currently taxpayers are becoming increasingly concerned about their tax burden, particularly their state-local burden, and it may well be that education is more vulnerable to taxpayers' revolts than other functions who draw their funds from the general revenues in the system.

It is not surprising that taxpayers are revolting, in view of the rapidly rising costs of state and local government. Education, for example, has averaged a 9.7 annual growth in expenditures during the past decade, while the gross national product has increased only 6.8 percent, and per capita personal income less than that. There is persuasive evidence that education is feeling the impact of resulting tax revolts. In California, 60 percent of proposed increases in school taxes for new bond issues were turned down by the voters, while in Michigan 20 of 25 requests for higher property tax rates were rejected, and even 31 out of 69 requests to continue current rates found the taxpayer saying no. It is not known whether a system in which support for education was drawn from a general local budget would have suffered these kinds of setbacks, but it is clear that the separate status of education makes it easier for the voters to work out their frustrations on public expenditures separately voted on than those which are drawn from a general budget.

Impact of Non-education Expenditures

Although not strictly a structural issue, the impact of non-education expenditures on educational ones is a useful way of examining the interaction among functions of government. These relationships are of considerable significance when suburban and central city expenditure are compared. Generally, central cities spend much more heavily for non-education purposes than do suburbs. Per capita non-education expenditures in central cities, according to the most recent data available, constitutes 166.7 percent of such expenditures made in the areas outside the central cities (i.e., in the suburbs), and non-educational taxes in the central-city areas were 190.9 percent of those raised by their suburban neighbors.(8)

Careful analysis of this characteristic does not substantiate the common-sense hypothesis that higher non-education expenditures cause lower education ones. In fact, it appears that the two, education and non-education expenditures, move together. If this finding holds firm after further analysis, it follows that the implication for central cities is a much larger tax burden than that of their suburbs since they must raise considerably more funds to meet their non-educational needs while simultaneously attempting to maintain competitive educational expenditures.

This "keeping up" problem raises the issue of the maintenance of competitive positions by school districts within the same region. The high-income suburbs are able to devote substantial resources to the support of education. The rest of the jurisdictions in their metropolitan areas (poorer suburbs and central cities), in order to compete for educational resources, must scramble to keep pace. The result of this competition, at least until the recent taxpayers revolt, is for these lower-income jurisdictions to struggle to maintain educational quality against very unfaborable odds.

The Role of State Aid

These disparities in local ability to support education could be overcome, of course, by an intergovernmental aid pattern designed to put larger amounts of resources in jurisdictions with less fiscal ability. Only in this way would genuine fiscal equalization result.

As is now known, state education aid does not work that way. The reason is that in the majority of states the amount of aid received is based on local property value per student. Since the formulae do not usually take into account either the special education needs of students concentrated in some school districts, or the non-education fiscal burden on the local property base which varies substantially from one kind of district to another, the result is a flow of aid to those school districts which already are relatively well off.

The jurisdictions which have both disadvantages -- i.e., students with special education needs, and a heavy non-education burden -- are, of course, the largest central cities. These cities are in a more difficult position additionally because of the cost differentials for land acquisitions, insurance payments, maintence costs, and other higher costs which generally exist within large urban places. Since the aid formula does not take into account any of these differentials, the result in most states is greater aid going to suburban school jurisdictions than to central cities. For example, in California state aid per pupil in the central cities is $234.29, while for the suburban areas it is $275.78. For New York, the similar figures are $372.51 for central cities and $474.06 for their suburbs. Similar data could be provided for other states. (See Appendix - Table I)

The overall impact of these disparities in aid support can only be determined by examining whether aid is additive or replacive of local tax effort. Does aid, for example, tend to act as a depressant to local tax effort, or is it simply additive to that effort with local tax effort being determined independently by the socio-economic characteristics of the community and the need for revenues for other governmental functions?

In general, aid is, at least in part, additive. Beyond that generalization, it is more difficult to make a definitive statement. But it does appear that aid tends to be more additive in suburbs than in large central cities. A study based on 1957 data, for example, found that for every dollar of aid given to suburbs there was a dollar of increased expenditures for education; that is, there was no replacive effect. While for central cities, the similar figure was a 70-cent increase in expenditures for every additional dollar of aid, thereby indicating that to some degree aid was replacive of locally raised funds for education, with those funds in all probability being siphoned off to be used for other functions of government.(9)

A more recent study confirms the same kind of disparity between the impact of aid in suburbs and central cities, but at lower figures. For suburbs, it is suggested that aid is additive by about 60 cents per dollar of aid, while in central cities the addition is about 22 cents.(10)

These findings demonstrate the disadvantaged position in which the present state aid system places cities. Not only do they receive less aid than their suburbs, but the aid they do receive makes a smaller contribution to total educational expenditures.

These aid characteristics added to the non-education fiscal responsibilities of cities helps to explain why total local tax burdens in cities tend to be considerably higher than in suburbs.(11)

The Role of Federal Aid

Since state aid does not offset the disparities in the local revenue base among school districts, does federal aid? A partial answer to that question is that federal aid does not because it is insufficient. In 1970-71 it constitutes only 6.9 percent of total revenue devoted to public elementary and secondary schools. This figure is less than the 7.9 percent which such aid constituted in 1965-66, but even this small amount of support is distributed in a way which makes a very small contribution to correcting the imbalances created by variations in local fiscal bases and state aid. Although there is considerable variation from state to state, the largest gainers from federal aid are neither central city nor suburban districts, but rather rural areas, those parts of states outside the metropolitan area. In California, for example, the central cities received on the average, in 1967, $39.00 per pupil from federal aid; in the suburban jurisdictions around the central cities the amount was $40.00; while the non-metropolitan parts of the state received $54.00 per student. In contrast, in New York the central cities received $60.00, while the suburbs and the non-metropolitan parts of that state received only $31.00.(See Appendix - Table II)

The one part of the federal aid package which tends to offset the imbalance among school districts within states is Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Although it is true that this program has not been as carefully focused on disadvantaged pupils as was intended by its authors, (12) the fact is that Title I aid has flowed to those school districts which possess the greatest need. For example, in California the central city received $19.64 per pupil, in contrast to its suburbs which received $11.09. In New York the comparable figures were $53.90 for the central city, and $12.35 for outside central city. (13) (See Appendix - Table I)

In summary, the intergovernmental flow of aid in the educational governance system does not offset the disparities in local revenue base which exist among school districts. State aid runs counter to any such correctional impact, while federal aid on the whole is almost neutral except for Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. From these findings, it would appear that the intergovernmental system, although it probably results in overall greater resources being allocated to education, does not offset disparities in local tax bases among school districts. These characteristics of intergovernmental flows of funds raises questions about how such flows might be altered and whether there are possibilities of changing the structural system in a way which would accomplish that.

State Distribution of Federal Aid

Another significant aspect of educational governance is the division process at the state level. A current study of this process concentrates on how states determine the distribution of federal funds which pass through the state on their way to local school districts. (14)

In the five states studied, it was found that the decisions about the distribution of federal aid were made almost exclusively by state education departments. In other words, the state's political process did not appear to influence or even become involved in the distribution, among school districts within the state, of federal funds which pass through the state education department. In the cases where the departments had considerable freedom in the distribution of the funds, they tended to follow the same pattern of distribution as that used for state aid. For those programs which were characterized by fairly strict federal guidelines, these guidelines determined the distribution of the funds.

Education Decision-making at the State Level

Since the role of both federal and state aid is dependent upon the decision-making process at the state level, as are most other educational issues, it is important to try to understand that process.

Sufficient studies of this process have not been made to offer any conclusive generalizations about its nature. However, in recent years enough have been done to at least suggest some hypotheses.

The basic constituency of state education departments, and the appropriate committees within state legislatures, include organizations of school board members, school administrators, teachers and educationally interested lay groups. To the extent that these groups present a common front, they are normally able to have an enormous influence on educational policy-making. In fact, their ability to agree usually results in their recommendations being accepted by state legislatures, except for some reduction in their financial demands.

For many years, these groups were rurally oriented, and as a result it was to this orientation that state departments of education responded. Further, state legislatures normally possessed the same rural orientation. A relatively harmonious set of relationships emerged, therefore, at the state level, resulting in a variety of significant educational innovations, including, of course, the consolidated school district. Further, state aid to rural districts was steadily increased, and there was a significant impact in many states on curriculums.

This happy confluence of forces at the state level seems to be disintegrating. In some states, top officials in education departments are beginning to concern themselves with urban rather than rural education. Teachers groups are finding it increasingly difficult to make common cause with organizations of school administrators and school board members. The teachers groups themselves are in conflict, particularly those that have both city and suburban teachers as members.

On the basis of a variety of studies of state educational politics, one scholar believes he has found four stages in the relationship of education to state government. The first stage is characterized by a strong local orientation, with the legislature being influenced primarily by local educational notables and state legislatures working out compromises when there are differences of view among them.

The second stage at which a good number of states have now arrived is the one which the educational interest groups have come together in some kind of common body and present a consensus of view on educational matters to both the state education department and to the appropriate legislative committees.

The third stage, which a number of states are now moving toward, and some have arrived, is one in which these various constituency groups have divided over significant issues and present conflicting recommendations to legislators. The fourth stage in which it is believed only one state has arrived is Illinois, in which a formal governmental institution, the School Problems Commission, has been established to work out these differences among the various constituency groups. Representation on this body includes not only professional education leaders but legislators, as well as representatives from more general citizens' groups such as the Chamber of Commerce. This group's consensus is then presented to the appropriate legislative bodies.(15)

The relationship between a state's stage of development and its educational outputs is not clear, but the movement is in the direction of education becoming much more a part of the political process than it has been in the past. It is quite possible that as a result of this change some of the issues raised here about how state and federal aid behave will become more active political issues.

Changing the Structure

There have been a variety of suggestions for altering the structural system which governs education. Perhaps the most hotly debated of these proposals is the wisdom of full state assumption of financing of education.(16) What is known about the fiscal aspects of education provides some clues about the significance of this kind of change.

A shift in financing would eliminate the current system of state aid to local districts. Since it has been found that aid is, to a large extent, additive to local effort, it is quite possible that the movement to full state financing would reduce the total resources allocated to education. In fact, other findings concerning the significance of the assignment of fiscal responsibility within governmental systems confirms this conclusion. In general, the highest state-local expenditures are found in state-local governmental systems which assign high expenditure responsibilities to their local governments while maintaining a large flow of aid funds from the state level to local governments.(17) These findings clearly suggest that state assumption might well reduce overall resources allocated to education.

On the other hand, it is not at all certain now how full state financing would affect the quality of educational services. As teachers make more and more demands and use the union device as a means of increasing the amount of resources allocated to teacher salaries, it may well be that extra funds which additional aid would provide for education will lead to higher costs rather than improved educational quality. We simply do not know whether unions would be as effective in bargaining in a statewide system as they are in their current situation of being able to play one school district off against another. Nevertheless, the potential for pinpointing and focusing educational resources would probably be greater in a state finance system than in one characterized by competing local school districts.

Perhaps this would be the greatest advantage of state assumption, the ability to focus educational resources to overcome the disparities currently existing in most state-local systems. Whether a state would take such action depends upon one's calculation about how the political process would work in the allocation of resources completely state controlled. One thing is certain, the legislature would give it more attention than it now does. Whether such legislative attention would result in more equity in the distribution of resources is not known, but much higher visibility would be provided through this kind of system than exists in the current, complex set of intergovernmental arrangements.

Important to the issue of full state financing is whether a local supplement would be permitted. On the one hand it can be argued that those communities which would like to improve the quality of education which is provided in their area should be allowed to do so, but if it is allowed then there would be a repetition of the current disparities between rich and poor areas within a state. An often suggested compromise is to allow a local supplement of no more than ten percent.(18)

It may also be argued that full state assumption of responsibility for education runs directly counter to current demands, heard particularly in large cities, for school decentralization and community control. Actually it would probably be as easy, if not easier, to decentralize within a state system than within the present local district system. More importantly, it might be possible within a state system to provide the necessary additional resources to those decentralized areas possessing large numbers of disadvantaged pupils. One of the primary difficulties with present large central city decentralization schemes is that they do not provide the additional resources required to make education effective in disadvantaged areas.(19)

Those who fear that full state assumption will mean the end of a long history of local control of schools should look again at the reality of the system of educational government. Financed and to one degree or another influenced by at least three governments -- local, state and federal -- there is no longer cause to argue that there are any genuinely autonomous units left in the system. Indeed, the whole governmental system is characterized by interdependency.

In addition, recent studies have concluded the centralization and decentralization are not inconsistent concepts and that it is quite possible to have financing at one level and policy-making and other kinds of control at another.(20)

State financing, therefore, is not inconsistent with small, local units, and, more importantly, it could equalize present tax-base-created disparities between school districts, as could, of course, a fairer state aid system.

Character of Federal Aid

Most students of educational affairs agree that federal aid for education is here to stay and should be substantially increased. This agreement rapidly disappears when the discussion turns to, what form should this aid take? Present revenue-sharing and block grant proposals of the national administration have moved this issue to the center of the political stage.

Although current knowledge about how aid performs does not provide a conclusive answer to the wisdom of these proposals, it does tell us how such new aid systems are likely to perform.

General revenue sharing, if allowed to be applied to education, would serve the interests of suburban schools better than those in central cities. To the extent such aid was distributed to local school districts by the state, there is no reason to assume its distribution would be any different than that of state-raised revenues. For those revenues passed through to local governments, it is likely that larger portions in cities would flow to non-education functions than to education. The opposite would occur in the suburbs.

Much the same generalization could be made about federal block grants for education. Except for Title I of ESEA current federal aid is not distributed very differently than state aid. The Title I experience seems to suggest that stronger rather than weaker guidelines are needed if federal aid is to be used to offset the discriminatory character of present state-local financial systems.(21)

A New Structure for Education?

If the purpose of examining the current structural characteristics of providing educational services is to design a new structure, that structure must maximize resources flowing to education while simultaneously distributing those funds on the basis of educational need rather than political influence. It must additionally optimize the quality of education services and provide for a substantial client input into educational decision-making. Such a system would have the following characteristics.

1. Full state assumption of financial responsibility for education;

2. A large increase in federal aid with strong guidelines for focusing the aid on educational need;
3. A decentralized system of local districts below the state level (with perhaps a regional level between the state and these decentralized districts);
4. Only if a regional system is used would a local financial supplement be permitted;
5. At the state level education should become an executive department like any other, with its head appointed by the Governor.

I think the reasons for most of these recommendations are self-evident, but perhaps two need further comment.

The regional suggestion is made primarily for the larger states and is also offered as a means of permitting a local financial supplement. On a regional basis such a supplement makes the most sense because it could be drawn from a much larger and more varied tax base. Such local resources could then be distributed on the basis of educational need. Further a regional level would provide a basis for providing specialized educational opportunities which would not be possible because of small size by the decentralized districts in the system.

The final suggestion of a state education department directly responsible to the governor is based on the very large role which the state would play in this new system, and the increasingly dysfunctional role of the "independence" and "no-politics" characterization of education. Current public attitudes about state-local taxes suggest that education could do as well, if not better, if it were part of the general budget of the state, rather than isolated from the regular budget any process by arrangements which attempt to perpetuate the "no-politics" myth at the state level.

Finally, but importantly, the evidence now available is by no means conclusive. This proposed system is drawn from my reading of "the hints and hunches" suggested by the research available. Another student of these matters might well draw other conclusions.

Appendix

Table I

Comparison of ESEA Title I with State Aid
For School Districts in Metropolitan Areas
1967

All Areas with Larger Than 500,000 Population	ESEA I (per pupil)	State Aid (per pupil)
California		
CC**(N=7)	$ 19.64	$ 234.29
OCC (N=119)	11.09	275.78
New York		
CC (N=5)	53.90	372.51
OCC (N=73)	12.35	494.06
Texas		
CC (N=4)	19.67	174.26
OCC (N=31)	12.25	209.35
Michigan		
CC (N=1)	37.15	238.13
OCC (N=31)	7.86	271.26
Massachusetts		
CC (N=1)	32.33	236.00
OCC (N=26)	7.95	110.26

**CC = Central City
OCC = Outside central city portion of metropolitan areas (suburban ring)

Source: Federal Aid to Education study, Syracuse University Policy Institute and Maxwell Graduate School.

Appendix

Table II

Federal Aid and Total Revenue
By Central City, Outside Central City, and Non-Metropolitan Areas.
1967

State	Fed. Aid	Total Revenue	% Fed. Aid
California			
Central City	$39	$684	5.8%
Outside Central City	40	817	4.8
Non-Metro	54	641	8.4
New York			
Central City	68	876	7.7
Outside Central City	36	485	3.0
Non-Metro	31	923	3.4
Texas			
Central City	38	479	7.9
Outside Central City	36	485	7.4
Non-Metro	63	535	11.8
Michigan			
Central City	29	683	4.2
Outside Central City	17	666	2.5
Non-Metro	30	629	4.8
Massachusetts			
Central City	69	675	10.2
Outside Central City	38	779	4.8
Non-Metro	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Source: Joel S. Berke, Stephen K. Bailey, Alan K. Campbell and Seymour Sacks Federal Aid to Education: Who Benefits? A Committee print of the U. S. Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity 92nd Congress, 1st Session, April 1971.

FOOTNOTES

1. For a good summary of many reform efforts see Childs, Richard S., *Civic Victories*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952.

2. Dawson, Richard and James Robinson, "Intra-Party Competition: Economic Variables and Welfare Policies in the American States," *Journal of Politics,* Vol. 25, May 1963, pp. 265-289: Thomas Dye, *Politics, Economies and the Public: Policy Outcomes in the American States*, Chicago: Rand McNally 1966; and Ira Sharkansky, *Spending in the American States*, Chicago: Rand McNally 1968.

3. For a summary of these views see Meranto, Philip, *School Politics in the Metropolis*, Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1969; and Roscoe Martin, *Government and the Suburban School*, Syracuse: Syracuse University Press 1962.

4. Iannaccone, Laurence, *Politics in Education*, New York: The Center for Applied Research, Inc., 1967, p.8.

5. See Ranney, David, *School Government and the Determinants of Fiscal Support for Large City Education Systems* (unpublished doctoral dissertation Syracuse University 1966); and H. Thomas James, J. Alan Thomas, and Harold J. Dyck, *Wealth, Expenditure and Decision-Making for* Education, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1963.

6. Minar, David W., "Community Politics and School Board," *The American School Board Journal*, Vol. 154, No. 3, March 1967, p. 37.

7. Iannaccone, *op. cit.*, pp. 82-100.

8. Sacks, Seymour, "Metropolitan Fiscal Disparities." *Journal of Finance*, May 1968, p. 236.

9. Campbell, Alan K and Seymour Sacks, *Metropolitan America: Fiscal Patterns and Governmental Systems*, New York: The Free Press 1967, pp. 137-154.

10. Sacks, Seymour, *Large City School Finances* (to be published by Syracuse University Press in the spring of 1972).

11. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, *Fiscal Balance in the American Federal System, Volume 2, Metropolitan Fiscal Disparities*, Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, October 1967.

Footnotes (continued)

12. Washington Research Project of the Southern Center for Studies in Policy and the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., Title 1 of ESEA: Is It Helping Poor Children? Washington, D. C., December 1969.

13. For a general analysis of how federal aid behaves see Berke, Joel S., Stephen K. Pailey, Alan K. Campbell and Seymour Sacks, Federal Aid to Education: Who Benefits? A Committee print of the U. S. Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, 92nd Congress, 1st Session, April 1971.

14. The five-state studies, as yet unpublished, are part of a Ford Foundation sponsored research project on the patterns of allocation of federal aid to education currently being conducted by the Policy Institute of the Syracuse University Research Corporation and the Maxwell Graduate School, Syracuse University.

15. Iannaccone, op. cit., p. 49.

16. See "Allen Urges Study of Proposal to Leg States Finance Schools," The New York Times, July 12, 1968.

17. Campbell and Sacks, op. cit., pp. 127-162.

18. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, State-Local Finances and Suggested Legislation, Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, December 1970, pp. 318-320.

19. Callahan, John and Donna E. Shalala, "Some Fiscal Dimensions of Three Hypothetical Decentralization Plans," Education and Urban Society, November 1969.

20. Committee for Economic Development, Reshaping Government in Metropolitan Areas, New York, February, 1970.

21. Levin, Henry M., "Financing Education for the Urban Disadvantaged," in Sterling M. McMurrin (ed.) Resources for Urban Schools: Better Use and Balance, New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1971.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS AND THE GOVERNANCE OF EDUCATION*

Roald F. Campbell

For several months officers of the Education Commission of the States and I have been discussing the need for a comprehensive study directed at emerging directions in the governance of education. We propose in that study to examine the important policy decisions for education and to determine how they are made, to note the variations among selected states in the structures and processes of policy making for education, and to develop some promising alternative models for the governance of education. Obviously, the study has not been made. Despite the lack of empirical data and extensive analysis which such a study would generate, I am being asked to present a position paper in the general domain of the projected study. While this assignment may be premature, my interest in the problem prompts me to respond. Should the proposed study be made, I may want the opportunity to present some amendments.

I suggested to the planners of this meeting that I could name a political scientist and an educationist who would represent positions more extreme than those Alan Campbell and I will present. Alan Campbell, as you know, is not only a student of politics but also of education. He and his colleagues in the Maxwell School at Syracuse University have conducted a number of important studies in education. Also, I have attempted in my own work to view policy making in education not only from an educational perspective but also from a political perspective. In a sense, Alan Campbell has moved toward education and I have moved toward political science. I hope these developments have extended our understandings and not merely hardened our prejudices.

---

* Prepared for conference sponsored by the Education Commission of the States, Jackson Hole, Wyoming, August 9-11, 1971.

A position paper seems to represent a blend of fact, analysis, interpretation, value judgment, and hope. I shall try to differentiate between and among these several ingredients but I am not sure I can always do so. With respect to our topic, intergovernmental relations and the governance of education, I shall first take a look at education, dealing with some of its current strains and stresses; note the governance problems among local, state, and national levels; consider the governance problems at each of these levels; and then move toward some kind of rationale for the governance of education as part of a complex social system.

STRAINS AND STRESSES IN EDUCATION

When we speak about the governance of education, it should be clear that we are really dealing with the governance of formal educational institutions, namely, schools and colleges. Education goes on in many settings: the family, the church, the neighborhood, the street gang, the boy scout troop, the museum, the library, the music hall, before the television screen, at work, and in countless other places. Indeed, education is an integral part of our culture, our social order, our very lives. In any of these settings education can be good or bad, depending upon the values we attach to the outcomes. Or, it can be intensive or random contingent upon the nature of the interaction between the situation and the person. I make this distinction between education and schooling for the reason that such a differentiation is frequently neglected and this neglect can distort one's views of the problems and the possible modifications needed in educational governance.

Even in looking at formal schooling we are confronted with at least six major programs. These include elementary and secondary education, higher education, the community college, vocational and technical education, adult education, and preschool education. Each of these programs is subject to further elaboration. The most obvious breakdown is public and non-public. While the governance of education applies most directly and completely to the control of public schools and colleges, nonpublic schools and colleges reveal a number of sub-divisions worth noting. Some of the nonpublic schools are church related, others are often grouped under the term independent, and still others might be categorized as reform or protest institutions. In this last group we might place a rapidly growing number of free schools, street academies, and other emerging institutions. Most nonpublic schools are nonprofit institutions but a number of proprietary institutions, particularly for training in business and some other vocations, still exist. Finally, we should recognize that a great many programs in both general and vocational subjects are sponsored by business firms, social agencies, and other organizations.

In addition to giving some consideration to the many educational programs which need governance, we must also consider how people now perceive education if we are to effect appropriate governmental arrangements. There is at present a rather wide-spread disenchantment with education. This is probably due, in part, to the general disenchantment with the performance of many of our institutions. Clearly, we are not doing very well with foreign policy, with the administration of justice, with the care of the poor, with the delivery of health services, with the purification of air and water, nor with the provision of quality education for all. But education may have an even greater cross to bear. For more than a century schooling has become a kind of religion in our nation. Such provisions as the establishment of public school systems, compulsory education, the growth of high schools, land grant colleges, community colleges, state equalization programs, and especially during the 1960s substantial national intervention in education all expressed our great faith in the efficacy of the educational enterprise. Important as each of these developments has been in our national development, we are victims of over expectation. Schools alone cannot solve all the problems of poverty, race, morality, job opportunity, domestic tranquility, foreign relations, or personal value orientation. In fact some critics, notably Illich, think we must actually deschool our society. Illich insists that we have confused "teaching with learning, grade advancement with education, a diploma with competence, and fluency with the ability to say something new."[1]

I doubt that we are quite as guilty as Illich suggests, but I think the tendency to confuse schooling and education, as noted above, is with us. I am not yet ready to scrap all schools and colleges. At the same time, doubt about their usefulness has helped create some of the strains and stresses in education to which a program of governance must give heed.

Redefinition of the school

In a sense, we are being asked to redefine the nature and purpose of the school. I shall speak more of the school than I do the college but many of the criticisms also pertain to higher education. There are two predominant themes in the current literature on American education. The first, well represented in Silberman's volume, Crisis in the Classroom, is the insistence that schools be made more humane. Silberman's chief criticism of the schools is suggested in the following:

> Most of all, however, I am indignant at the failures of the public schools themselves. "The most deadly of all possible sins," Erik Erikson suggests, "is the mutilation of a child's spirit". It is not possible to spend any

---

[1] Ivan Illich, Deschooling Society. New York: Harper & Row, 1970, p.1.

> prolonged period visiting public school classrooms without being appalled by the mutilation visible everywhere-- mutilation of spontaneity, of joy in learning, of pleasure in creating, of sense of self. The public schools-- those "killers of the dream," to appropriate a phrase of Lillian Smith's-- are the kind of institution one cannot really dislike until one gets to know them well. Because adults take the schools so much for granted, they fail to appreciate what grim, joyless places most American Schools are, how oppressive and petty are the rules by which they are governed, how intellectually sterile and esthetically barren the atmosphere, what an appalling lack of civility obtains on the part of teachers and principals, what contempt they unconsciously display for children as children.[1]

Many teachers and school administrators read the excerpt shown above with some shock. They find it hard to believe that the institutions in which they work and which they have helped shape are inhumane. They find it even harder to believe that as individual persons in those institutions that they behave in inhumane ways. However, a number of parents and students find much justification in Silberman's words.

The Silberman study and other pronouncements of similar tone have helped create and sustain the movement for more humane schools. As is true with many movements, adherents are of many kinds. Some see this as the new thing in education and as opportunists they wish to be on the band wagon. Others wish to examine school practices to determine if indeed they are inhumane and if so how they can be appropriately modified. In some ways, the move to make schools more humane is similar to the progressive education movement of the 1920-s and 1930-s. There is talk about the whole child, affective as well as cognitive development is stressed, individual interest is seen as one of the keystones in learning, and much emphasis is placed on an informal school atmosphere.

---

[1] Charles E. Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom. New York: Random House, 1970, p. 10.

The primary schools in England are seen as the best models of the new schools and many American educators are now making pilgrimages to the new Mecca. Teachers colleges have organized courses on humane schools; supervisors in school systems have a new gospel to promulgate; and teachers are being asked to modify their practices to be less formal, to give more attention to pupil interest, and to treat each youngster as a unique human being. Some parents, particularly in upper middle-class suburbs, have also heard of the movement and have become adherents. Such parents attempt to get modifications in public school practice. If not successful in that effort, some of them join together and form a free school of their own.

The second current thrust in American education is the accountability movement. The term, itself, means different things to different people and this helps explain its popularity. To some, accountability means more complete reporting on what is being done and with what results. To others, accountability means a guarantee of a specified outcome. To many, accountability deals with defined purposes, specified procedures, and full reporting of results. The accountability movement has obvious relationships to such formulations as management by objectives, program budgeting, and cost-benefit analysis.

Some of these ideas, as you know, have been around some time. The program budget (PPBS) was apparently used with some success by Secretary McNamara in the Department of Defense and President Johnson, by Executive Order, requested in 1965 that the formulation be applied to all federal agencies. In 1967 Secretary Gardner prepared guide-lines and asked that the practice be applied to HEW including the U.S. Office of Education. From that time on attempts at program budgeting were made in federal education projects and the idea was often advocated for state and local educational agencies.

Leon Lessinger, one time Associate Commissioner of Education in the USOE, did much to promote the idea of accountability in education. For him, the performance contract was the epitome of accountability as can be seen in the following:

> Accountability is the product of a process. At its most basic level, it means that an agent, public or private, entering into a contractual agreement to perform a service will be held answerable for performing according to agreed-upon terms, within an established time period, and with a stipulated use of resources and performance standards. This definition of accountability requires that the parties to the contract keep clear and complete records and that this information be available for outside review. It also suggests penalties and rewards; accountability without redress or incentive is mere rhetoric.[1]

I do not think, as Lessinger may suggest, that accountability and the performance contract are identical. I do see the performance contract as one expression of the accountability movement. The idea behind the performance contract is a simple one. Usually, the school system specifies certain desired outcomes, defines a target group of pupils, stipulates some of the conditions under which the instruction is to take place, and enters into a contract with an agency - most frequently a private firm - for the provision of instructional experiences designed to bring the target group of pupils to the desired outcomes. Payment to the contractor is contingent on the achievement or performance of the pupil with respect to the specified outcomes. Testing of pupil achievement is usually determined by nationally normed achievement tests and often administered by an outside testing contractor.

It is significant to note that in the 1969-70 school year there were but two performance contracts, the now famous Texarkana case and one in Portland, Oregon, whereas in 1970-71 there were over 50 such contracts.[2] Twenty of this number were supported by funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity. The others were supported in a variety of ways, some by the use of USOE funds and others by regular school district revenues. While these contracts have not been implemented without problems, they have demonstrated that educational objectives can be defined in specific terms, that instructional procedures can be carefully programmed, that teachers and teaching aids can be trained to implement the procedures, and that pupils - even those below grade standard - can improve their achievement in such areas as reading and mathematics. One can argue about the nature of such a program, about the types of motivation employed, about the validity of test results; but, for many, the contractors have demonstrated what the schools, in many cases, could not or would not demonstrate, that business procedures can be applied successfully to instruction.

---

[1] Leon Lessinger, "Engineering Accountability for Results in Public Education" Phi Delta Kappan. 52(Dec. 1970) 217-225.

[2] See Roald F Campbell & James E Lorion, Performance Contracting in Education. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., - in press.

In many ways these two movements, accountability and humaneness, are in conflict. The accountability movement stresses precise objectives, planned allocation of resources, specified procedures, and measurement of outcomes. The humane or informal school, on the other hand, places great stress on spontaneity, flexibility, individual differences, and creative experiences not only in the academic subjects but also in the arts. There is little concern with measurement and great concern with feeling, joy, and openness. One movement is highly rational and precise. The other is largely impressionistic and flexible. In many ways, it is the difference between a science and an art.

Both movements are causing schools and colleges to examine their nature and purpose. Clearly, no school or college can move completely in both directions. How far toward humaneness and how far toward accountability and in what ways these two movements can be made to complement each other are the questions confronting both professionals and laymen in education. This dilemma, compounded with the Illich remedy that we ought to deschool society altogether, make many persons quite uneasy about the whole educational enterprise.

It is conceivable that both humaneness and accountability are, in a sense, passing enthusiasms and symtomatic of a more fundamental problem. Green has suggested, for instance, that the present crisis in education stems from our general belief in the efficacy of education, particularly our conviction that all youth should complete high school, and our almost complete success in attaining that goal. Now we are faced with new conditions which seem to demand that we examine the basic assumptions upon which our educational system of the past century has been based. In any case, the nature and the purpose of the school and college is being seriously questioned.

New organizational structures

Another response to the questions being raised about schools is the push for new organizational structures. This is perhaps most clearly seen in the demand for decentralization characteristic of most of our cities. Again, we are confronted with a word which has different meanings for different people. Even so, in New York City the decentralization movement has been responsible for the creation of thirty-one school districts for the operation c elementary schools. Each of these districts now has a board of education and a superintendent of schools. Presumably, citizens also feel that they can exercise more influence with these local boards than they could with the city-wide board which preceded them. It should be noted that the operation of high schools is still a centralized function as is the financing of all of the schools.

As of January, 1971 the Detroit schools were also decentralized by the creation of a thirteen-member Central Board of Education and eight five-member regional boards of education. The chairman of each of the regional boards is included in the membership of the central board. The

---

[1] Thomas Green, "The Ironies of Educational Growth." Bode lecture, Ohio State University, 1971.

Detroit plan does not go as far by way of decentralization as the New York plan but it does change appreciably governance arrangements for the Detroit schools. Almost every city, even those with a quarter the population of Detroit, have given some consideration to decentralization.

While cities are experiencing a decentralization thrust, the long time effort to combine school districts in rural areas continues. Over the nation there are now about 18,000 operating school districts, whereas twenty years ago that number was over 100,000. States have responded very unevenly to the reducation of school districts. Hawaii has but one school district, while Nebraska still has over 3,000 such units. States with many rural school districts will probably continue to effect consolidations when program and financial advantages can be demonstrated.

There is also considerable discussion at this time about the creation of metropolitan governing units of one kind or another. Little actual movement in this direction has taken place. One notable example seems to have been the creation of Nashville-Davidson County school district in Tennessee. Of particular interest in that case is the fact that metropolitan school government tended to follow the creation of metropolitan municipal government.[1] School districts in a number of Southern states embrace an entire county, hence in some cases by their very nature they are metropolitan districts. The Dade County, Florida school districtls perhaps the best example of this condition. School districts in other metropolitan areas have cooperated for specific purposes but few areas have chosen to follow the Nashville example and go all the way.

Related to the metropolitan school district idea has been a movement to reconceive the county or intermediate school district which still persists in many Northern states. The typical county office, particularly in some of the Midwest and Western states, is an anachronism of the last century when the county superintendent was supposed to supervise as many as one hundred one-room schools. In recent years, it has become clear that the office ought to be eliminated altogether or it should become a service unit staffed to provide specialized help to smaller schools in those areas not economically feasible in each of the school districts. In this reconception it has become clear that such an office in sparsely settled areas can serve the schools in more than one county. Notable progress has been made in such states as Iowa, Michigan, and Wisconsin[1] in the reorganization of intermediate districts, often including several counties. In many ways, the intermediate district may come to provide some of the functions for rural areas that a central office in a decentralized city school district could provide to the local or regional districts within the city.

---

[1] Robert J. Havighurst (Editor), Metropolitanism - Its Challenge to Education. Chicago: 67th NSSE Yearbook, Part I, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1968, ch. 16.

Movements for the creation of new structures whether regional districts in a city, a combination of districts in a rural area, or the generation of an effective intermediate office all add to the strains and stresses now being felt in education.

More participants

Schools are experiencing still another kind of stress. Within the past few years participants, once rather quiet, have insisted upon a voice in policy making. These outspoken partners include many blacks and representatives, other minority groups, teachers, and students. Regarding school performance, the blacks tend to agree in thinking that schools have not done well in teaching the children of the poor and indeed test results tend to support them in such a position. Blacks are not of one mind about the remedies which should be applied to the situation. Many of them believe that the solution is to be found through desegregation and ultimately genuine integration in the schools. Some blacks, on the other hand, particularly after observing some attempts at desegreation, often including the busing of black kids but not white kids, insist upon separate schools for blacks. Blacks in both camps have become quite cynical about the commitment of whites to any plan of equal educational opportunity for all children and youth. This cynicism is often fed by the inability of local school boards to get white support for desegregation plans and by what many perceive to be a vacilation regarding school desegregation by the President and the Congress.

---

[1] Roald F. Campbell et. al. The Organization and Control of American Schools. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1970, ch. 5.

In any case, school boards are confronted with demands from blacks and other minorities for improved education. These demands often include more black teachers and principals and the establishment of black studies programs. At times demands also include community control of the schools, a move many blacks perceive as equivalent to the control now exercised by citizens in suburban school districts. Clearly, school boards have difficulty in meeting all of these demands. Lack of movement promotes dissatisfaction on the part of the blacks and that dissatisfaction gets expressed in many ways including the defeat of bond issues and operating levies proposed by the school districts.

Teachers have also become militant partners in the school enterprise. The day when school boards and superintendents might treat teachers in a benevolent but patronizing manner is gone in many districts. Local teachers organizations, whether affiliated with the National Education Association or with the American Federation of Teachers, insist upon reviewing school budgets, upon playing a role in the establishment of personnel policies, and upon making their own demands regarding salaries and working conditions. When teachers find that local boards cannot meet their requests, they frequently join forces and put pressure upon the governor, the state legislature, and even the Congress and the President.

Two outcomes of teacher militancy will be noted. At the state level twenty-six states have passed laws which recognize in one or more ways teachers organizations and legitimize the negotiating process.[1] Even in states without such laws negotiation is now very much a fact of life. A second problem for school boards resides in the fact that many demands made by teachers run counter to those made by school patrons, particularly blacks and other minority groups. For instance, teachers are strong for certification and examination procedures for admission into the profession, while blacks see many of these programs as designed to screen blacks out of the profession. Again, teachers are strong for the right to transfer in the school system, while blacks see such a desire as a way of removing experienced, and presumably more capable teachers, from the slum schools. The fact remains that school boards must mediate between teachers and minority patrons, frequently almost an impossible task.

Students, too, particularly at the secondary level, have become more articulate in demanding a voice in educational policy making. Frequently, these demands have led to the disruption of the schools. The House Sub-committee on General Education became involved in a study of student activism and sent a questionnaire to all of the nation's 29,000 public and nonpublic secondary schools seeking information about disruptions occurring in 1968-69. More than fifty percent of the schools responded and eighteen percent of them had experienced "serious protests." The major issues involved were rules, dress codes, services and facilities, and curriculum matters. In more than fifty percent of the cases there were racial overtones in the protests.[1] In the Syracuse survey directed by Bailey, eighty-five percent of the urban high schools reported some type of disruption in the last three years.[2] These disruptions included student boycotts, arson, property damage, and student-teacher physical confrontation.

---

[1] Compact, February, 1971.

In a very real sense, citizens in minority groups, teachers, and students have demanded a voice in school governance. Add to this augmented intervention on the part of both state and national agencies and we can understand why boards of education are overwhelmed with their new partners.

Lack of money

Still an additional problem in education today, and in some ways a product of attempts to meet other stresses, is the great difficulty encountered in financing education. In a recent study of superintendents the financing of education was reported almost to the man, as the most serious problem confronting education.[3] This dilemma is clearly reflected in the increasing percentage of operating levies and school bond issues defeated by the voters in one district after another. Two decades ago 99 percent of the operating levies in Ohio received voter approval. Today the figure is 29 percent.

Federal aid, which in the 1960's rose from about four percent to eight percent of the total bill for elementary and secondary education, has actually decreased to 6.7 percent. The percentage of revenue from state sources, over the past decade has changed very little, actually averaging for all the states thirty-nine to forty percent over that entire period. With school costs rising faster than the gross national product, with costs for higher education rising even more rapidly, and with an economic recession, all within the context of disenchantment with schools and colleges, prospects for adequate financing are certainly not bright.

---

[1] Reported in Stephen K. Bailey, Disruption in Urban Secondary Schools. Washington, D.C.: Nat. Assn. of Secondary School Principals., 1970.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Russell T. Gregg & Stephen J. Knezevich, "The Superintendent: What Makes Him What He is?" American School Board Journal, 158 (June 1971) 12-17.

By way of reiteration, I have noted the concern with the nature and purpose of the school, the development of new organizational structures, the emergence of new partners in policy making, and finally the financial stress faced by educational institutions. In addition, there is a movement to establish alternative schools, a point to be elaborated later. This enumeration could suggest that I see no hope in the schools and colleges as we have known them. This is not the impression I wish to convey. In spite of all of these problems, many pupils are learning, much effective teaching is going on, and many parents are pleased with what is happening to their children. Our very success convinces us that we are not doing well enough. As with the larger society, schools are at a watershed. There must be re-examination and reform. This reform will have implications for governance. It seems quite possible that the governance model of consensus, characteristic of schools over the last several decades, will give way to a model which can deal more effectively with conflict. In any case school governance must pay more attention to the pluralistic nature of our society.

GOVERNANCE PROBLEMS AMONG LEVELS

It seems desirable to distinguish between general and special government for education. At the national level there is government for education; education is very much a function of general government. In other words, all three branches of government deal with education as they deal with other matters. By way of greatest contrast, education at the local level, in large part, tends to be a case of special government. The local board of education as a state agency is usually independent of municipal authority. School board members are, with some exceptions, elected by the voters of the school district, which may or may not conform to municipal boundaries, frequently in a special election, and nearly always on a nonpartisan ticket. At the state level education is governed by a mixture of special and general government.

Forms of government designed specifically to cope with education have developed in every state. In nearly all states a state board of education composed of laymen, most often appointed by the governor but in a number of cases elected, has come into being. All states have a chief state school officer. In over half of the states the chief state school officer is selected by the state board of education and serves as its executive officer, while in the remaining states his relationship to the state board of education is less well defined.

But the development of this special government does not take education out of general government. The state legislature retains plenary power for education. The legislature may create special machinery, may charge state boards and state superintendents with particular functions, as it has done, but it may also alter the machinery and call back the functions. Moreover, the governor's budget is still a most persuasive instrument with most legislatures. State boards and state superintendents may recommend to the governor a budget for the schools of the state but neither the governor nor the legislature is required to accept such recommendations. Thus, at the state level special government for education supplements but does not replace general government.

More national influence

Only since the depression of the 1930's and World War II has national influence in the governance of education been appreciable and sustained. To be sure, we had the land grant college and the vocational education acts, but most public school systems had little to do with the federal government except as a modest amount of federal money was distributed through state departments of education for certain vocational programs. During the depression, with the advent of such programs as WPA, PWA, NYA, and CCC, the schools felt some national impact. Federal funds were used to build or renovate school buildings, provide student aid, establish nursery schools, and feed students from poor families. In addition, CCC Camps and NYA Schools became, in a sense, alternative school systems.

Most of these federal programs were disbanded as we went to war in the 1940s. Upon the conclusion of the war the G.I. Bill of Rights created, among other things, our first national scholarship program and both schools and colleges felt its impact. Also following the war the Congress passed the National Science Foundation Act in 1950, the federal impact laws (PL 815 & 874) in the same year, and the National Defense Education Act in 1958. The 1960s saw the passage of much educational legislation including the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Higher Education Act.

It is clear that federal influence has increased appreciably. Most of the support provided has been categorical in nature. Much of it has been aimed at programs designed to equalize educational opportunity for the poor or to compensate for inadequate prior opportunity. The federal courts, particularly through the Brown decision and subsequent litigation, have insisted that the schools take the lead in desegregating our society. This position has perhaps done more to point up our national dilemma than any other policy decision at any level of government. At the same time, it has placed tremendous implementing obligations upon many school districts and most state departments of education

Another example of federal influence is found in legislation designed to strengthen state departments of education. The Congress transferred, for the most part, the administration of the ESEA, Title III funds for experimental projects, from the U.S. Office of Education to state departments of education.

As part of this transfer, however, there has been an insistance on the part of OE that states evaluate these projects, indeed that states evaluate all federal projects. Since most states had little capability in evaluation, there has also been federal money provided to establish such capability. The lack of planning and evaluation capacity in state departments has also been noted by Congress and OE and much of the money available through ESEA Title V and Title IV, Section 402 has been for the development of planning divisions in state education agencies. This new money for evaluation and planning has required state departments of education to rethink their functions and their structure, not always comfortable demands. Moreover, in trying to strengthen state departments, particularly in preconceived directions, The federal government has made such departments very dependent on federal financing. Actually, in 1969 federal funds accounted for forty-one percent of all state department expenditures.[1] Strength and dependence are hardly compatible. It should also be noted that any success in strengthening state departments goes counter to our long tradition of localism in the governance of education.

Another aspect of national influence has been the multiplicity of federal administrative agencies with which states and local districts must deal. Mrs. Green[2] has noted the fragmentation of federal effort and has suggested greater consolidation and coordination of federal programs in education. Each of several federal agencies deal with local school districts and state agencies. One example of this is the action of HEW in the desegregation programs in many school districts. If districts are not conforming to the law and to the administrative regulations developed by HEW a finding of non-compliance may be filed against the district. If remedial action is not taken, the case is taken to the courts. At times, it seems that the officials in HEW interpret the desegregation policy of the federal government much more rigorously than does the Congress. These diverse interpretations make action at the local school district most difficult to plan and to implement.

---

[1] Mike M. Milstein, "The Federal Impact on State Agency Planning." Planning and Changing. V 2 (April, 1971) 31-38.

[2] Report of the Special Subcommittee on Education, Study of the U.S. Office of Education. Committee on Education & Labor, U.S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1967.

In many ways federal influence on education has been more pervasive than the federal funds provided would suggest. This influence seems to stem from two conditions. One, the federal money has been for special purposes and the implementation of these special purposes has had consequences for the entire operation. Two, the U.S. Office of Education appears to see itself as the chief mover of educational reform. In addition to these consequences of federal action, federal practices in the distribution of money have been particularly galling to school administrators. Appropriations are frequently very late, funding is nearly always on a one year basis, program emphases change almost yearly, and the OE and other agencies are reorganized and personnel changed so frequently that it is almost impossible to retain contact with the agencies.

More state influence

I have already suggested that state departments of education were exercising more control over education, frequently in response to federal action. But this movement seems to stem from many other sources as well. Conant[1] and others have suggested that states take over the primary financing of elementary and secondary education. Some governors have actually recommended to their legislatures programs designed to move in this direction. If the state finances all or a large part of the expenditures for public education, I think it follows that the state will exercise considerable discretion in how the money is to be expended.

---

[1] James B. Conant, Shaping Educational Policy. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Or, if the state pursues a program of more planning and evaluation, this will have repercussions not only for the state agency but for the local districts as well. In many ways these activities are geared to the push for accountability to which we have already given attention. It is not inconceivable that states will require some kind of cost benefit data from school districts if they are to participate fully in state funding. Particularly, is this the case since financial outlays for education have gone up faster than the gross national product and thus represent unprecedented demands upon state government.

Encouragement of alternative schools

In many ways both national and state governments have encouraged the establishment of alternative educational systems. For instance, in Titles I, II, and III of ESEA nonpublic schools or at least pupils in nonpublic schools were to be given support. Title I provided that both public and nonpublic schools enrolling pupils from poor families were to receive help. Title II stipulated that library and instructional materials were to be made available to public and nonpublic schools. Experimental programs, provided by Title III, were to be funded through local school districtes but those districts were required to work with other agencies, including nonpublic schools, in the planning and operation of such programs. Such legislation seems to be an extension of the concept of child benefit as set forth by the U.S. Supreme Court in Cochran.

Federal precedent and the financial needs of nonpublic schools have caused many state legislatures to consider ways by which public money might be used for nonpublic education. Recently, for example, the Illinois legislature established a study commission and authorized the commission to secure outside research help in analyzing the situation in Illinois. . Under the direction of Donald Erickson a comprehensive report[1] was prepared and became the basis for a legislative program in this area. Many state legislatures have already provided some support for nonpublic school pupils. Often at the state level the argument is advanced that nonpublic schools will close without public assistance and such action would add greatly to the cost of public schools and in the end require more tax revenue than the partial support of nonpublic education. Erickson, in the study noted above, makes a number of other arguments for the support of nonpublic schools including one growing out of the need to preserve considerable cultural diversity in our kind of society. The acceptance of these arguments does not remove all constitutional questions nor does it dispense with all of the opposition, but it does suggest a willingness on the part of many persons to consider an alternative to the public schools.

Also outside the public school structure, has been the development of a number of new institutions under a variety of names. Sometimes these are known as informal schools and are organized by a group of parents who wish much more flexibility and humaneness in the education of their children than seems to be found in many public schools. Most of these schools enroll a small number of pupils, frequently they are for young children but some have been organized for adolescents, one or at most a few teachers are involved and they are often young and committed to a free and flexible learning environment.

Other protest institutions have been called store front schools or street academies. The store front schools in Harlem have attracted considerable attention for the success they apparently have had in dealing with dropouts. Other examples include the Highland Park Free School in Boston and The Learning

---

[1] Donald A. Erickson, Crisis in Illinois Nonpublic Schools. Research report to Elementary & Secondary Nonpublic Schools Study Commission, State of Illinois, December, 1970.

Place in San Francisco.

The U.S Supreme Court has just decided that plans of state payments to nonpublic school teachers for their teaching of the secular subjects, at least in the states of Pennsylvania and Rhode Island, unconstitutional.[1] While this is a set back for nonpublic schools, I suspect that the logic of providing nonpublic schools with partial funding and the political support for such a program will lead to new legislation designed to avoid the unconstitutional aspects of current statutes.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has also given support to the testing of educational arrangements out of the traditional public school approach. In the year just closed as noted above, OEO provided almost seven millon dollars to test the idea of performance contracting in twenty local school districts. In each case, one or more private firms have contracted to provide instruction to a group of pupils for a period of one school year and to guarantee a certain level of achievement or forfeit payment for such service. At this time the outcome of such an experiment is hard to predict but the very nature of the program casts some doubt on the capacity of the public school system to perform its chief function, the instruction of the young.

Not to be outdone, the Office of Education has provided an investigator with money to explore the voucher plan. Under this arrangement a parent might send his child to a school of his choice, public or nonpublic, and submit his voucher, collectable from tax money, as payment for the schooling. I understand that feasibility studies of the voucher plan are to be made in three school districts in 1971-72. These and other efforts at both national and state levels highlight the need some people have to seek alternatives to the public school system.

---

[1] Lemon V. Kurtzman, June 28, 1971.

Local boards still have a place

As already suggested both national and state governments are exercising greater control over education and all indications are that such a movement is not yet at an end. Two developments help explain this trend. The first is the increasing importance citizens generally place on education, even though they may become skeptical of certain schools and school practices. A second reason is found in the ever increasing costs of education. In other words, the importance and the cost of education make it a national and state problem and not chiefly a local problem as once was the case.

This situation is often interpreted to mean that local boards of education exercise less and less discretion and the time may be approaching when they can be eliminated altogether. There are many motivations for such a prediction. Boards are sometimes seen as getting in the way of the professionals, teachers and administrators. Or, boards are seen as containing some of the demands of citizens, particularly minority groups. At other times, boards are seen as unresponsive to the bureaucrats in state and national government.

I doubt that any of these groups are going to wish away boards of education. Moreover, I point out that local school boards have a most important role to play in the governance of education, despite national and state influence. Indeed, some national and state action can give local boards opportunities which did not previously exist. Particularly is this true if school boards see themselves chiefly as ministerial bodies, as was intended from the beginning, with some policy making and judicial functions as well.

GOVERNANCE PROBLEMS AT EACH LEVEL

At the local level

Just as there are problems of governance among levels of government, there are also problems of governance at each level of government. At the local level the issue is one of long standing. School districts have been seen as state agencies and as such are relatively independent, with some exceptions, from municipal government. This autonomy has been cherished by boards of education, superintendents, and citizens generally. Frequently, it has been defended as the way of keeping politics, or at least political corruption, out of the schools.

Actually, as James[1] and his colleagues have shown, no school district has complete autonomy or independence; rather school districts have different degrees of dependence on other governmental bodies. The categories of dependent and independent as applied to school districts are thus not very useful. Moreover, James was not able to demonstrate that degree of dependence had much to do with the revenues made available for school purposes.

These findings, notwithstanding, the question still remains, should school governance be part of general local government and be related more closely to the governance of parks, recreation, health, social service, and the courts. Clearly, these other functions can and do affect the educational function. For instance, youngsters needing health care are poor learners. School play grounds and city parks seem to have a natural affinity. The taxpayer is well aware of the rapid increase in property taxes and makes little distinction between the tax demands for schools and other local government.

Many school districts have been slow to recognize these interrelationships and have been loath to join even in a plan of voluntary coordination between education and other social services. This relative independence of school districts has caused some mayors to seek legislative relief. For instance, in the school building area the independence of both the New York and the Chicago school districts has recently been curtailed by the use of a local building authority designed to consider building needs of all governmental units, including school districts. Townsend[1] has recently studied the transfer of power from the Chicago Board of Education to this new Cook County authority which is presumably more sensitive to the Mayor, who is also Chairman of the Cook County Democratic organization, and to all agency building needs in the county. It seems probable that other inventions of this kind will follow.

---

[1] H. Thomas James et.al. "Wealth Expenditure & Decision Making for Education," Cooperative Research Project No. 1241, U.S. Office of Education, 1963.

As noted above, the presence of special government for education is most pronounced at the local level. At this level the long tradition of separation between special and general government will make new arrangements difficult to establish. At the same time, such factors as the increasing urbanization of our society, the growing conviction that school problems are also city problems, the recognition that education goes forward in many settings, the increasing costs of all public services, and-despite folklore to the contrary- the more clearly perceived fact that the control of education is in the political arena suggest that present arrangements will be scrutinized and changed when need be.

At the state level

Problems of educational governance may be even more severe at the state level. Forty-eight of the fifty states, and soon that will be forty-nine[2], have state boards of education. In most cases these board members are appointed by the governor but in nine states they are elected. In few cases have state boards of education been strong bodies regardless of their method of selection. Sroufe[3] found that boards in most states had low visibility and that board members were relatively unknown and indistinquished whether appointed or elected. As board members have very modest self expectations, others expect little from such boards and little is received.

---

[1] Richard G. Townsend, "New Schools for Chicago: A Political-Administrative Analysis." Ph.D. Dissertation, Dept. of Education, Univ. of Chicago, 1971.

[2] The new Illinois constitution, adopted in 1970, provides for a state board of education.

[3] Gerald E. Sroufe, "State School Board Members and the State Education Policy System." Planning & Changing. V.2 (April, 1971) 15-23

The impotence of many state boards is further emasculated by the fact that in 21 states the chief state school officer is elected by popular vote and hence cannot be held accountable by the board or any other agency of government. The long hassle in California between a former board and superintendent illustrates the problem. Even when the chief state school officer is appointed by the board, it is often difficult to secure a strong person. This condition stems from at least two causes: weak boards seldom attract strong executives, and state school administration is not generally as prestigious as local school administration, particularly in major cities or select suburban districts. In most states we are thus left with mediocre boards and executive officers of moderate ability who often have a need to weigh every action in terms of its contribution to re-election.

These public officials exert little leadership in education. They tend, instead, to perform the regulatory duties ascribed to their offices. Until recently, this state of affairs seemed acceptable to most people. Local school district official and most citizens were quite content to have little power exercised at the state level and more discretion at the local level Even governors and legislators were comfortable to have the education agency play a modest role. But the situation has changed.

The size of the education budget at the state level has become so large that it must be weighed against other fiscal demands. The pressures to support nonpublic schools have mounted. Reservations about the purposes, procedures, and outcomes of the whole educational enterprise have been entered. The need for school reform seems clear. In short, more information about education, its organization, its operation, and its results is being demanded by governors, legislators, and citizens generally. All of this has been augmented by the insistance that quality education be made available to all people, including our minority groups.

All of these pressures make governors more aware of educational problems and more determined to play some role in educational reform. Legislators, too, have been forced to come to grips with educational questions as never before. As a result the tranquil life of state boards and superintendents has come to an end. More and more these officials are being asked to provide more information, more planning, more evaluation as well as to perform their customary regulatory functions. Federal funds, as noted above, have been made available to help state agencies perform these new functions. But the new demands and the new resources do not necessarily create willingness and capability on the part of the state departments.

As a result governors and legislators are often forced to turn to other agencies and sources for information. At the same time, there is active consideration in many states regarding the reorganization of the state education arm. Some governors would dissolve state boards and make the state superintendent responsible directly to the governor. Again, this is the expression of the issue of general or special government for education.

At the national level

I have already alluded to some of the problems of educational governance at the national level. These include the multiplicity of federal agencies dealing with education and the administrative difficulties engendered by frequent change of program emphasis, lack of lead time for planning, and instability of federal support. But there are more deep-seated problems. These stem in large part from uncertainty regarding the role the national government should play in education. Is it to be limited in scope and deal only with a few apparent national needs such as providing better opportunity for the poor? Or, is it to recognize that education is so much a part of our total national well being that it deserves broad and substantial support from federal sources? Categorical aid seems to be more closely related to the first position, while general aid or block grants of some kind are perhaps more compatible to the second position.

Whatever policy positions regarding education are taken by the federal government, there is still the question of congruence among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches. This is not easy to achieve for the reason that education does become a part of many other functions. For instance, the schools have become a major battle ground for civil rights. Many of the decisions handed down by the courts since Brown have been in the civil rights context, frequently with little regard to their overall educational consequences, particularly the fact that local schools must maintain the support of local citizens or they cannot operate.

Organization of the administrative branch at the federal level to serve education is still a difficult question. In terms of size of operation a good case can be made for removing the U.S. Office from HEW and setting the education agency up with a cabinet level head. President Nixon, on the other hand, has proposed a Department of Human Resources which would include not only what is now located in HEW but more as well. These are very divergent views that require consideration.

Within education itself organizational questions are demanding attention. A National institute of Education, patterned somewhat after the National Institutes of Health, has been proposed.[1] The Levien report would place the Institute in HEW and coordinate with the U.S. Office of Education. Others would make it a part of the U.S. Office. One aspect of the issue is whether the research function should be separated from the funding of operational programs. When these functions are placed in the same office, as at present, research and development needs seem to take second place to the needs of the operational programs. Health and agriculture have apparently been more successful than education in channeling resources to research. At the federal level the problem seems to be much less a case of general vs. special government for education and much more a case of deciding the role of the federal government and developing adequate governance structure for education within the general government.

---

[1] Roger E. Levien, "National Institute of Education: A Preliminary Plan for the Proposed Institute." Report prepared for HEW, 1971.

TOWARD A RATIONALE

We have noted a number of the strains and stresses affecting education. We have considered some of the problems of governance among levels of government - local, state, and national. And we have also observed some of the problems of government at each of the levels of governance. We are now at the point of saying what should be done about all of this. Once again I wish that the study to which I alluded earlier had been completed so that I might have a more adequate base from which to make these projections. In the meantime, here are some tentative propositions.

Interdependence

First, we should look upon the local, state, and national governance of education not as three separate and distinct systems of governance, each jealous of its own perogatives, but rather as a total governance system with great interdependence among the subsystems. We have learned that there is no way by which certain functions can be placed at any one of the three levels and be completely ignored by the other two levels. Indeed, as Grodzins[1] has pointed out, federalism is a plan for sharing the functions of government and not a plan for separating them. Moreover, this is not a new idea; it has been inherent in our federal system from the beginning.[1] Perhaps the relative unimportance of formal schooling in a frontier society helped develop our strong tradition of localism in education. In any case, federalism in the governance of education languished for much of our history. Since World War II this has changed.

---

[1] Morton Grodzins, "The Federal System," in Goals for Americans. Report of President's Commission on National Goals, Englewood Cliffs,: N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1960, ch. 12.

There are good reasons to support the concept of federalism, even in education. First, we are no longer a rural but an urban, technological society characterized by great mobility of population. Second, our society was postulated on an informed electorate, necessary at all levels of government, and our early land grant acts as well as state constitutions made it clear that citizenship, as it came to be called, was a major purpose for establishing public schools. Third, education and training provide not only economic benefits to the individual but they contribute to the economic well being of the entire nation. Finally, only at the national level can the matter of equal treatment for all, even in education, be assured. Each of these points could be explicated but that is not my purpose here.

Another characteristic of our federal system is its capacity for a problem to be "bucked" from one level to the next. If citizens at the school district level feel dissatisfied with their treatment at the hands of the local board of education, they may generate a movement for change and carry it to the state department of education or to the state legislature. In like manner, dissatisfactions at either local or state level may ultimately find expression and frequently action at the national level, either on the part of a agency of the administrative branch or on the part of Congress itself For example, the movement toward decentralization in cities, notably in Michigan and New York, has been achieved through appeal to state legislatures. Frequently, the application of civil rights in education as in other spheres has been appealed to the national level. Again, the interdependence of the three levels of governance is exemplified.

---

[1] Roald F. Campbell & Gerald R. Sroufe, "Toward a Rationale for Federal-State-Local Relations in Education", Phi Delta Kappan. 46(Sept. 1965)2-7.

This is not to say that each of the three levels of government can not have some focus in the total context of governance. I think for instance, that the major responsibility for the operation of schools should remain at the local level. With state constitutions and state statutes being what they are, it is clear that the chief legal responsibility for the establishment and support of schools is at the state level. I think that responsibility should remain there and be exercised more vigorously, as I shall argue later. Only at the national level can a complete picture of national needs be seen, hence, I believe the national government should pay genuine attention to national needs and provide resources to cope with such needs. This is at best a gross division of basic responsibilities and should be seen within a total system of governance where interdependence and flexibility are always present.

For the successful operation of the federal system each of the levels of governance must be strong. One of the greatest arguments for the consolidation of small, sparcely populated school districts is for the preservation of local government, not its destruction. A puny school district has very little voice in interactions with state or national agencies. In similar manner state education agencies must be strengthened if they are to interact effectively with national and local agencies in the governance of education.[1] In recent years, we appear to have had a great increase in national influence, sometimes without much interaction with state or local agencies in education. I seek some redress in this balance. In other words, I would like to make our interdependent system truly interdependent.

---

[1] See Roald F. Campbell, et.al., Strengthening State Departments of Education. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1967.

Focus at state level

Second, the chief focus for the improved governance of education should be at the state level. This is not to deny needed improvements at both local and national levels, some of which are noted below, but the state, it seems to me, occupies a unique position in our system of governance and that position has been largely unimplemented. In the first place, as noted above, states are legally responsible for the establishment, operation, and support of public schools and they have general jurisdiction over nonpublic schools as well.

States have delegated the actual operation of public schools to local districts and I think that such delegation should remain. However, even delegation needs some surveillance. Moreover, delegation does not remove state responsibility for the establishment, support, and general supervision of the school system. In exercising that responsibility states occupy not only a unique legal position, they occupy a pivotal position in the whole federal system. States, even more than local districts or national agencies, can make federalism work. States can provide appropriate feed-back to the Congress and the administrative branch. States can also give careful attention to the operating problems faced by local school districts. Many of our governance problems stem in large part from inattention, lack of competence, little courage, or inadequate revenues at the state level.

Some of the state inadequacies may be due to structure but I suspect the malady is more than that. Structure is at best a means to an end. Even so, structure may make it easier to follow improved procedures, hence, we must give some attention to structural arrangements. In my view, state boards of education should be retained and state board members should be appointed by the governor with the approval of the senate. I take this position for three reasons. First, I think the governor should play an important role in the governance of education and thoughtful exercise of the appointment function can contribute to that role. Second, I think that a governor who takes his appointment function seriously, is in a better position to place able and representative citizens on the state board of education than is an elective procedure where inevitably state board candidates are far down on the ballot and little known to the electorate. Third, able and representative citizens appointed by the governor are in a good position to interact with the governor regarding the problems and needs of education in the state. I realize that appointment procedures have not always resulted in these outcomes but I still believe they can. It may be desirable to establish a nominating mechanism in a state for the purpose of identifying suitable candidates for the governor's consideration. Gubernatorial appointment, if implemented, would require that the election of state board members be discontinued in some states. In many states it would require that appointment procedures be taken much more seriously.

As a second structural change, I would make the chief state school officer an appointee of the state board of education and have him serve at the pleasure of the board. Only in this way can the board be adequately staffed and can the executive officer be held accountable. Election of the chief state school officer, still the practice in twenty-one states, is an anachronism which should no longer be permitted. I realize that some very able men have been elected. I also know that board appointment does not guarantee competent executives. Despite these caveats, if we are going to rationalize our structure at the state level I think chief state school officers must be selected by state boards and made responsible to them.

Let us now turn from structure to function. I think it important that state education agencies continue with their regulatory functions. In many cases, these functions need to be performed even more faithfully than they are now. At the same time I am convinced that state agencies need to provide leadership in education far beyond what most of them are now doing. This leadership function will require substantial augmentation of planning and evaluation activities.

Planning is almost unknown. To be sure, in recent decades there has been some planning for higher education, particularly on the part of state coordinating boards for higher education. At the school level, there has also been some planning in terms of physical plant needs. Beyond these two examples, neither school districts nor state agencies have made much use of planning procedures. Planning involves the setting of goals, the generation of information relative to those goals, and the projection of programs, both short-term and long-term, to achieve the goals. Obviously, goal setting is a political process in which many must share but the state education agency can do much to see that a planning climate is established and that educational and political leaders have something to consider. Crisis budgeting, now so prevelant at both district and state levels, can be changed only by the perspective which can come through long-range planning.[1] Planning on the part of the state education agency hopefully in conjunction with the general planning arm of the state, for meeting state-wide education needs should also lead to more planning at the local level for district-wide needs.

Evaluation is closely related to planning. Indeed, when evaluation is broadly defined, as it has been by Stufflebeam,[2] it means the generation of information for decision making. Activities are of four kinds: context evaluation or situational analysis, input evaluation or consideration of alternative courses of action, process evaluation or assessment of procedures, and product evaluation or determination of outcomes. This formulation takes nothing away from the importance of the traditional concern about results but it adds appreciably to the total concept of evaluation.

---

[1] See Edgar L. Morphet & David L. Jesser, Emerging State Responsibilities for Education. Improving State Leadership in Education, 1362 Lincoln St., Denver, Colo., 1970.

[2] Daniel Stufflebeam, et.al., Educational Evaluation & Decision Making. Itasca, Ill.: Peacock Pub. Co., 1971.

Evaluation in this larger context can be viewed as a management system. It bears a relationship to management by objectives, to program budgeting, and to cost analysis. Whether or not we follow the precise Stufflebeam formulation, it seems very important that state education agencies have a continuing program devoted to the analysis of the social and educational conditions of the state; to the development of alternative courses of action designed to cope with these conditions; to the presentation of these alternatives, with supporting evidence, to the state board of education, to the governor, to the legislature, and to many other groups; to a continuous system of evaluating the processeses followed in the implementation of adopted programs and consideration of the outcomes of such programs; and to a recycling of information about both process and outcome so that such programs might be improved, augmented, or dropped.

Few structural changes are needed to permit state education agencies to augment and improve their planning and evaluation functions. What is needed is a determination on the part of chief state school officers and state board members to institute such programs, learn to work with them, and modify internal organization and procedure to take account of a more rational approach to state problems. Once internal capability has been established, there may still be the problem of implementing the approach with local school district officials and the political leaders of the state. In many cases these persons are already demanding approaches of this kind.

National Changes

Third, the governance of education can also be improved at the national level. In terms of structure, two major changes are called for. To begin with, agencies dealing with education should be substantially reduced in number. While it is probably not possible nor desirable to place all educational functions in the U.S.Office, it would seem entirely possible to place the administration of most of the operating programs in that office. There appears to be considerable merit in separating the projected National Institute of Education, which is to be devoted to research and development, from the administration of operating programs.[1]

With the emergence of education as an important national function, a second structural change is suggested. In some way the status of education should be raised in the federal government. One alternative is that of giving the chief education officer cabinet rank. Or, if the Nixon plan of a department of human resources should be implemented, a prominent role for education should be established within that department. Perhaps, following the pattern established in the Defense Department, there could be a Secretary of Education. Responsible to the secretary might be the U.S. Commissioner for the operating programs in education and a coordinate officer in charge of the National Institute of Education. If education remains in HEW, at least an associate secretary for education in that Department might serve as chief for the Commissioner and for the Director of NIE, assuming its establishment.

Where reassignment of education functions to the education agency is not feasible, much more attention should be paid to coordination among agencies at the federal level. For example, in the desegregation area at the present time, it appears that the position of some of the HEW people is quite different from the position of the Congress. One way of testing this is for states and institutions which have been given findings of non compliance by HEW to resist such findings and review them with their congressional delegations and if need be to let them go to the courts for determination. In other words administrative regulations may have to be tested by the legislative or judicial branch of government.

---

[1] See report of Commission on Instructional Technology, To Improve Learning. Committee on Education & Labor, House of Representatives, U.S. Gov't. Printing Office, 1970.

Even at the judicial level, recent court decisions may have gone beyond Brown. In any case, some of these decisions appear to have little regard for the over-all consequences of some of the desegregation measures required of school districts. The insistance on racial balance in the schools of Richmond, Virginia, for instance, has apparently resulted in the migration of whites from that city to the point that the Board of Education is now in the federal courts contending that it cannot achieve racial balance in the schools unless the two neighboring county-wide school districts are annexed to Richmond. I, for one, wonder how far we go to achieve racial balance. What distances are pupils to be bused to achieve that end? How much resistance among both white and black parents can be incurred? What evidence do we have that the only road to quality education is through the mixing of the races? Is desegregation the only value with which we are concerned? In many places, disregard of over-all consequences of desegregation measures is actually destroying public support for the school system.

Turning from structural coordination to the financing of education at the national level, a number of changes are recommended. To begin with, total revenues available should be increased. There is considerable support for this position. Education does contribute to the social good on a nation-wide and not merely on a state or local basis. Mobility is a characteristic of our society, hence, educational deficiencies in any part of the nation tend to affect other parts of the country. In a more positive sense, increased knowledge through research and graduate training for scholars and high level professionals create national resources and add to national manpower pools. Only at the national level can nation-wide needs be identified and adequately supported. It is also true that some states are less able to support educational programs than others, hence, federal aid, among other things, should provide some equalization at the national level. It seems entirely reasonable that the national contribution to school support might be raised appreciably. In like manner, as suggested by the Carnegie Commission[1], support for higher education both to institutions and to students should be increased.

As more money is allocated to education, attention must be paid to the educational functions to be supported. As noted above, national support of research, development, and graduate training seems quite clear. Actually, the chances of support for educational research are meager at state and local levels, hence, if federal funds are not made available there will be little research and development in education. But federal funds should also be made available for operating programs designed to meet pressing educational problems and to supplement state and local effort in other operating areas.

These considerations suggest that federal aid might take two forms. Categorical aid might be continued when it is clear that severe problems require national effort. In addition, block grants, revenue sharing, or general aid might be made available to the states to supplement state funds for special and general educational purposes as defined at the state level. This supplementation will become even more critical as states assume a greater share in the financing of schools.

The U.S. Office of Education, other national agencies having to do with education, and the Congress can do much to improve the operation of the federal program. To begin with, federal programs should be established as the result of planning procedures and should come to represent some kind of sustained effort. In other words, state and localities should be able to depend upon some kinds of federal support. As part of this procedure the U.S. Office and other agencies should provide sufficient lead time so that projects and programs submitted by state departments, school districts, and institutions can be carefully planned and, after approval, can be appropriately staffed. Finally, there must be developed, as there has been in some other departments, a plan of continuing or multiple year funding. Present practices of hastily contrived staffing subject to year end dismantling should be discontinued.

---

[1] Quality and Equality: New Levels of Federal Responsibility for Higher Education. Report of the Carnegie Commission, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.

Local changes

Fourth, the governance of education at the local level should be improved in both structure and process. In terms of structure, I think the consolidation of sparcely populated rural districts should continue. Instead of 18,000 operating districts we should probably have about 5,000. Both enrichment of program and economy of scale argue for further consolidation. In this reorganization it would be helpful if school district boundaries were made to coincide with the boundaries of other governmental units whether a city, a county, or several villages and their surrounding areas. Coterminous boundaries would make collaboration between school districts and other jurisdictions much easier. Obviously, this implies some rational plan for the organization of other governmental units as well as school districts.

Within cities some kind of decentralization is called for. In most cities this will not require, in my judgment, the breakdown of city-wide school district into a number of legal entities. In many cases, it seems to me that regional sub-districts could be formed administratively without establishing a number of new legal entities, each largely autonomous and jealous of its own powers. I take this position for two reasons. First, there are many things that should not be decentralized such as the raising of revenues for school operation. Second, I doubt that there will be true decentralization until each building unit in a city has considerable autonomy. This condition may be harder to achieve in multiple city districts than in a single city district.

While I think there is much to be said for the idea that each school district should be able to offer a program from kindergarten through grade 12, a criterion often used in guiding the reorganization of school districts, this goal poses constraints as well as advantages. It suggests to many school board members, legislators, and to citizens generally that any programs not falling within the magic K-12 formula may be less necessary or even undesirable. Actually, school districts should be free to set up nursery schools, adult programs, community colleges, vocational training, and experimental programs of many kinds if the educational needs of the people require them. If for some reason regular school districts do not have state authorization or revenues to organize and operate many kinds of programs, the creation of special districts for such purposes should be possible. These special districts, such as the one for special education in Saint Louis, County, Missouri, could work closely with regular districts in performing particular services. Intermediate units in rural areas might also be authorized to serve as special districts for programs not feasible in many smaller units. My point is that regular school districts should have program flexibility and the possibility of creating school districts for special purposes should also exist.

I am not yet ready to put school operation in the hands of the mayors and the city councils. I am ready, as noted above, to make school district boundaries, wherever feasible, coterminous with those of other jurisdictions so that there is a better basis for the consideration of common problems. I also believe that there must be much more collaboration between and among school districts, city governments, and agencies representing recreation, health, welfare, housing, employment, and law enforcement. Some of these agencies are municipal, some are county, some are state, and some are national. All of these agencies contribute, directly and indirectly, to the education of the child. That relationship would be made explicit and should be nurtured positively.

In the selection of school board members I think we must find a way of making boards of education more representative. I am convinced that a board made up of our "best" citizens does not sense adequately the educational problems confronting many people, particularly minority groups and the poor. There must be a willingness and a procedure whereby some of the leaders of minority groups can be represented on boards of education. In most school districts this can probably be done through the electoral process. In large cities where the electorate has difficulty getting information about the candidates, an appointment system by the mayor may be preferable to popular election.

Boards of education, generally, need to change some other practices. More adequate arrangements for the participation of citizens in school governance should be developed. In my view, this can be done on a wide-spread basis only if provided for at the level of each school. This is another reason why I support the idea of decentralization to the building unit. School boards also face a particularly knotty problem in resistance to change found in many teachers organizations. Boards can no longer dictate to teachers, neither should they take dictation from teachers. A way must be found whereby the expertise of teachers can be taken into account along with the demonstrated needs of students, the values espoused by the parents, and the expressed will of the larger society.

In a pluralistic society, such as ours, and particularly with respect to an important function, such as education, there will be conflict. School boards must prepare themselves to deal with conflict. One step in conflict resolution is to make the board itself more representative, as suggested above. Another is to provide for citizen participation at many levels, also noted above.

A third is to select a board chairman who has some facility in conducting a meeting, in providing for delegations to be heard, in permitting debate, in dealing fairly with all persons, and in terminating unnecessary discussion. The time is past for honorific chairmen; skilled presiding officers are needed. Finally, conflict resolution requires accurate information, a point to which we now return.

School boards have traditionally made decisions upon the recommendations of their superintendents and often boards and superintendents have had little reliable information as background for such decisions. Even more significant than the paucity of relevant information has been the fact that most boards have had no system by which information could be supplied or by which the value positions involved could be made explicit. That situation must change. The demand for accountability, for the reporting of results, for program budgeting, for cost-benefit analysis all argue that school boards must have better planning and evaluation capability. Larger school districts should establish planning and evaluation units of their own and such services should be made available to smaller districts on a collaborative basis of some kind.[1]

By way of summary, I have suggested that formal education is at a critical point in our history. Part of this condition may be ascribed to a general disenchantment with our established institutions but part of it is also due to conditions surrounding schools and colleges themselves. I have indicated that the schools, particularly, are under many strains and stresses including great concern with their nature and purpose, the growth of alternate systems, the push for new structures, the demands of new participants, financial distress, and finally more vigorous intervention from state and national agencies. Consideration was then given to some of the governance problems among local, state, and national levels; and to some governance problems at each of these levels. Finally, I turned to a consideration of at least a beginning rationale for an intergovernmental approach to the governance of education. Major points were: first, a need to recognize, not the separation of powers at local, state, and national levels, but the interdependence of the total governance system; second, the pivotal position of the state in making our federal system work, and the need in states to update their structure and build in planning and research capabilities; third, the need to give education a more stategic place in the structure of the federal government, to augment federal aid for both categorical and general purposes, and to build in some stability to that financial support; and fourth, the continuation of local school districts but with some restructuring in both rural and urban areas and with more collaboration with other governmental jurisdictions. These changes require a rational approach to our problems, a conviction that structure must be made to serve program, and a continuing quest for accountability in government.

---

[1] See New Dimensions of School Board Leadership. A seminar report, Evanston, Ill.: National School Boards Association, 1969.

RFC: djr

SUGGESTED COMPACT

State Responsibilities

1. Maintain a free public school system.
2. Provide a mechanism for setting goals and objectives in education (with widespread participation in their development), logical and systematic planning for accomplishment of goals, appropriate evaluation to determine if goals are being accomplished, and reporting to the public.
3. All children between 6 and 16 will be required to attend a school or will be provided a suitable educational experience.
4. Insure that no child will be denied admission to any public school because of his race, religion, or ethnic origin.
5. All public accredited elementary and secondary schools will maintain a program of instruction designed to meet the varying needs of all children and youth in the state, including:
   a. Appropriate remedial or specialized education available for all children in need of such instruction,
   b. Year-round educational opportunities available, tuition free, for those needing or desiring them,
   c. Every young person shall have available (1) a cluster of practical skills useful in employment, or (2) the preparation necessary to pursue postsecondary education

upon graduation or leaving formal schooling.

6. The state shall encourage innovation and development of new educational programs and provide for their financing and evaluation. Examples are early childhood and adult and continuing education.
7. The state has the responsibility to provide for a uniform, comprehensive system of education, and data and management information for use in decision making at both state and local levels.
8. Each state shall provide improved evaluation and planning competency at the state level plus aid to the local education agencies in this vital area.
9. Adequate financial resources will be available for public schools in all parts of the state without excessive local tax burden and with such burden fairly distributed among the state's citizens.
10. Annual state appropriations for schools will be completed in time for effective planning by the local education agencies.

Federal Responsibilities

1. Federal categorical aids should be consolidated into a few "block grants" in which the amount of aid to any state is related to its educational need and to its fiscal effort to support schools. The latter should not be based solely upon expenditures for the federally aided programs; instead it should be based upon the total expenditures from state and local sources.

2. The federal government shall provide substantial educational funding to the states for general aid supplementing state-local funds so as to make educational services more nearly equal between and within states.
3. The federal government shall fully fund educational programs to meet specific national objectives.
4. Federal funds for public schools, except for payments to local school districts in lieu of property taxes, will be granted to states and administered by state education agencies under federally approved state plans.
5. In order to qualify for federal financial aid, the federal government shall require that "no child is denied admission to any public school because of his race, religion, or ethnic origin."
6. Annual federal appropriations for public schools will be completed in time to permit effective planning by state and local education agencies.
7. The federal government should assume primary responsibility for financing and coordinating research and development for education, seeking to solve educational problems of common concern to all states.
8. The federal government shall develop and help finance, in cooperation with state and local education agencies, an interconnecting system of educational data and information.

APPENDIX C

THE EQUALIZED MATCHING APPROACH TO REVENUE SHARING FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

A weakness of most revenue-sharing plans is their failure to include built-in assurance that state and local tax effort will be continued. The equalized matching plan is designed to provide such assurance.

Under the equalized matching plan, federal reimbursement percentages would be computed for each state from a statutory formula, and each state would receive a federal grant equal to the product of its federal reimbursement percentage and the amount it expended from state and local sources for public school support during the preceding school year. The federal reimbursement percentages would be inversely related to the state's per capita income, so that low income states would receive a greater percentage grant.

The suggested formula for computing the federal reimbursement percentage is:

$$\text{Federal Reimbursement Percent} = \frac{25\%}{\text{State's Fiscal Capacity Index}} - 5\%$$

The federal reimbrusement percentage formula would be established by law. The subtraction of 5% from the quotient makes the average federal contribution rate equal to 20% and introduces an equalizing factor. The State's Fiscal Capacity Index is the quotient obtained by dividing the state's per capita income by the national average per capita income. For a state with average income per capita, the fiscal capacity index would be 1. Using the above formula and recent information concerning the per capita income for each state, it is possible to estimate the range of federal reimbursement percentages among the states.

State Fiscal Capacity Indices, based upon personal income per capita for 1969, ranged from .6 in the state with the lowest per capita income to 1.25 in the state with the highest per capita income. The suggested formula would provide federal reimbursement percentages as follows:

	Fiscal Capacity Index	Federal Reimbursement Percentage
High Income State	1.25	15%
Average Income State	1.00	20%
Low Income State	.60	36%

The use of personal income per capita to determine a State's Fiscal Capacity Index is based upon the assumption that the total personal income of the people in a state is a valid measure of their capacity to pay taxes. Other measures of fiscal capacity may be substituted for personal income using the same formula to determine the matching ratio for each state. This is possible since the Fiscal Capacity Index for a state of average fiscal capacity will always be equal to 1.

Under this plan, a state would qualify for its grant by its own effort to support public schools. This approach has a built-in assurance that the state would not reduce its effort. A reduction in state and local effort would result in a decreased federal payment during the ensuing year. In this sense, the federal grant would be an incentive for at least maintaining state and local effort for public school support.

The total state and local current expenditures for public schools would be computed for each state each year by first determining the total amount it expended during the preceding school year for current public school purposes. This total would include amounts for kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, and summer schools. From this total would be deducted amounts contributed by the Federal Government for the current support of these school programs during the preceding year. Estimates of the amounts due each state, under the equalized matching plan, are shown in the attached table.

Under the equalized matching formula, the total annual federal contribution for the general support of public schools would be equal to approximately 20 percent of the amount contributed from state and local tax sources. However, it is anticipated that some federal categorical aids would be continued, making the total federal contribution for all programs approximately equal to 22 percent of the total cost of public elementary and secondary schools.

While these overall amounts are reasonable, they would need to be approached gradually, perhaps over a three or five-year period. However, the ultimate goal should be established at the outset, so that orderly fiscal planning is possible.

The equalized matching approach is based upon the assumption that states and local school districts will continue to provide most of the funds needed to operate public schools. Federal funds are supplemental, intended to compensate for deficiencies in state and local school revenues and to provide an incentive for continued state effort to support public schools.

The equalized matching plan has a relatively clear purpose -- to share public school costs on an established percentage basis and to provide an incentive for continued state "effort" in the support of public schools from state and local sources. Under this plan, the appropriation process should be less controversial, since the states would "earn" their federal apportionment by contributing amounts from state and local tax sources. Moreover, the percentage relationship, once established, would not need to be changed each year to reflect changes in the value of the dollar. With such stability, effective local planning would be facilitated.

The chief criticism of the equalized matching plan is that it might provide an incentive for extravagance in educational expenditures. However, if the maximum state reimbursement percentage is less than 40% and, in high income states, less than 20%, the danger that federal aid would constitute an incentive for extravagance is minimized.

However, an additional constraint upon the equalized matching approach, limiting the effect of extremely high or low state and local effort, is suggested. Under this constraint, no state could receive more than 110% or less than 90% of the national average amount per pupil. This constraint was used in computing the estimates shown in the table.

ESTIMATED FEDERAL AID PAYMENTS TO STATES, UNDER THE EQUALIZED MATCHING PLAN, USING TOTAL PERSONAL INCOME TO DETERMINE THE FISCAL CAPACITY INDEX

State	Estimated State and Local Sch. Revenues Per Pupil in ADM 1969-70	Total Personal Income Per Capita, 1969	Fiscal Capacity Index	Federal Reimbursem't. Percent	Estimated Federal Aid Per Pupil in ADM
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
U. S. TOTAL	$ 782	$3,687	1.00	20%	$156
Alabama	444	2,582	.70	31	140
Alaska	818	4,460	1.21	16	140
Arizona	794	3,372	.91	22	172
Arkansas	466	2,488	.67	32	149
California	733	4,290	1.16	17	140
Colorado	747	3,604	.98	21	157
Connecticut	1,260	4,595	1.25	15	172
Delaware	977	4,107	1.11	18	172
Florida	727	3,525	.96	21	153
Georgia	527	3,071	.83	25	140
Hawaii	961	3,928	1.07	18	172
Idaho	541	2,953	.80	26	140
Illinois	1,004	4,285	1.16	17	171
Indiana	641	3,687	1.00	20	140
Iowa	813	3,549	.96	21	171
Kansas	861	3,488	.95	21	172
Kentucky	571	2,847	.77	27	154
Louisiana	619	2,781	.75	28	172
Maine	678	3,054	.83	25	170
Maryland	906	4,073	1.10	18	163
Massachusetts	829	4,156	1.13	17	140
Michigan	766	3,994	1.08	18	140
Minnesota	854	3,635	.99	20	171
Mississippi	442	2,218	.60	36	159
Missouri	710	3,458	.94	22	156
Montana	751	3,130	.85	24	172
Nebraska	663	3,609	.98	21	140
Nevada	787	4,458	1.21	16	140
New Hampshire	725	3,471	.94	22	160
New Jersey	1,021	4,241	1.15	17	172

State (1)	Estimated State and Local Sch Revenues Per Pupil in ADM 1969-70 (2)	Total Personal Income Per Capita, 1969 (3)	Fiscal Capacity Index (4)	Federal Reimbursem't. Percent (5)	Estimated Federal Aid Per Pupil in ADM (6)
New Mexico	$ 616	$2,897	.79	27%	$166
New York	1,262	4,442	1.20	16	172
North Carolina	566	2,888	.78	27	153
North Dakota	687	3,012	.82	25	172
Ohio	720	3,738	1.01	20	144
Oklahoma	493	3,047	.83	25	140
Oregon	921	3,573	.97	21	172
Pennsylvania	910	3,659	.99	20	172
Rhode Island	798	3,858	1.05	19	152
South Carolina	563	2,607	.71	30	169
South Dakota	594	3,027	.82	25	149
Tennessee	535	2,808	.76	28	150
Texas	592	3,259	.88	23	140
Utah	652	2,997	.81	26	170
Vermont	903	3,247	.88	23	172
Virginia	693	3,307	.90	23	159
Washington	846	3,848	1.04	19	161
West Virginia	617	2,603	.71	30	172
Wisconsin	943	3,632	.99	20	172
Wyoming	706	3,353	.91	22	155

Sources:

Column 2: Derived from information reported by NEA Research Division in Estimates of School Statistics, 1970-71 (NEA: Washington, D.C., 1970) Tables 3 and 9.

Column 3: U.S. Commerce Department, Office of Business Economics: Survey of Current Business (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, August, 1970), p. 35.

Column 4: Column 3 divided by the National average personal income per capita, $3687 (computed by multiplying col. 2 by 1/3687 equal to .000271223).

Column 5: 25% divided by Fiscal Capacity Index (Column 4) minus 5%.

Column 6: Column 5 multiplied by Column 2, but not less than $140 nor more than $172.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1972 O - 455-446